

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CLXXI.]

MARCH, 1859.

[VOL. XV.

THE PROGRESS OF SCIENCE IN RELATION TO RELIGION, FIRST, IN MODIFYING ITS FORM, AND SECONDLY, IN ATTESTING ITS SUBSTANCE:

ILLUSTRATED FROM PROFESSOR OWEN'S ADDRESS AT THE OPENING OF "THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE," HELD AT LEEDS, SEPT. 1858.*

THE comet which has lately been in view to the inhabitants of this part of the earth, has been regarded with different feelings by different classes of persons. Here is the agricultural hind who has never moved five miles from the spot where he was born, and who possesses little more intelligence than the cattle among which he spends his days—what is his notion of the comet? Scarcely can he be said to have any notion of it at all. He sees it there in the skies, and stares at it with a certain dull and unspeculating wonder, and having once gazed gazes no more. What it is he knows not, and he cares as little as he knows. The schoolmaster of the village, able to get pretty well through words of three syllables, declares the comet to be a body of fire struck off from the sun, and wandering at will in the planetary spaces. The parson of the parish declares that the comet is a messenger sent from the right hand of God to declare his displeasure and announce his wrath on England for some national sin—perhaps the toleration of Popery, perhaps the admission of the Jews into Parliament. A fourth opinion has a representative in our supposed village—it is the opinion of the parson's constant assailant, the blacksmith of the place. He is a reading man, or at all events he is a talking man. Equally opposed to the view of the hind, the schoolmaster and the clergyman, he profoundly declares that "the comet is a comet, and that's all;" there were comets aforetime, there will be comets in the time to come. Whence they are, what they are doing, whither they are going, who knows? Has not he himself inquired and got no answer? Let the comet go its own way and let us go ours.

This laissez-faire plan, however, does not suit every one in the village. Among the schoolmaster's pupils there is one wiser than himself. Having learned how to read, he has turned the skill to good account. He thinks as well as reads. Having had

* Continued from p. 98.

his eye drawn to the comet, he wants to know all about it. What is he to do? He has, indeed, some vague and superficial notions as to its nature, origin and destiny, but they are only such as to stimulate his curiosity. How shall he get the knowledge he desires? He learns that in a neighbouring city dwells a person who has given all his days to the study of the heavenly bodies; he will go and seek information at his lips. Will he act wisely? All agree that so to do is to act wisely. Would it not be better to consult the schoolmaster? No; for it is his business to teach the alphabet, not to study the stars. Would it not be better to consult the parson? No; for well acquainted with the letter of the Bible, he knows little of its spirit, and is full of vulgar prejudices respecting extraordinary phenomena of any kind. The best thing he can do is to go to the astronomer. If he wished for advice in regard to his health, he would do well to send for the medical practitioner. If he desired to make his will, let him call in the solicitor. But if he is inquiring about the laws of the material universe, he must consult the persons who make those laws their study.

Such is the nature of the step I take when I ask Professor Owen what report the material universe makes as to its own origin. "Whence," I inquire, "Whence this great all,—the universe?" The question I cannot help putting. The question is forced on my heart, and of its own accord rushes to my lips, for I am not a doltish hind; perpetually inquiring after causes, I am both impelled and compelled to inquire after The Cause of the universe; nor am I an ignorant schoolmaster, and so satisfied with a mere fancy; nor am I a superstitious parson, and so ready to see a judgment in every new thing; nor am I a secularist, and so drilled into the opinion that nothing is known and nothing can be known of The Cause of the universe. Possessed of some culture and a healthy curiosity, I want to know whence this universe, myself included; and under the pressures of this want, to whom shall I go? Can I do better than consult those who are universally regarded as the great oracles of science? those who apply all their powers to the study of the universe? those who report all that is certain in the results of human investigation and discovery?

But is anything certain?—for if all is uncertain, I may spare myself the trouble. Yes, much, very much, is certain. Scientific truth is certain truth. Scientific truth is as certain as any human knowledge can be. Absolute certainty, that is certainty which in its very nature cannot be uncertain, belongs only to the Absolute Being. But the truths of science are as certain as that one and one make two, that a hundred-weight is a heavier load than a pound, and that to-day will be followed by to-morrow. If so, then the human mind is a reliable teacher. And if the human mind is a reliable teacher, then has religion a solid found-

dation on which to rest. What is the foundation on which science depends? The human mind. What is the foundation on which religion depends? The human mind. On the same foundation, then, religion and science repose. If the basis is good for the one, it is good for the other. It is indeed good for both. Such is the decision of Professor Owen as expressed in these words:

“God has given to man a capacity to discover and comprehend the laws by which His universe is governed; and man is impelled by a healthy and natural impulse to exercise the faculties by which that knowledge can be acquired. Agreeably with the relations which have been instituted between our finite faculties and the phenomena that affect them, we arrive at demonstrations and convictions which are the most certain that our present state of being can have or act upon. Nor let any one, against whose prepossessions a scientific truth may jar, confound such demonstrations with the speculative philosophies condemned by the apostle; or imagine that wilful intellect, soaring to regions of forbidden mysteries, has aught to do with the acquisition of such truths as have been or may be established by patient and inductive research. For the most part the discoverer has been so placed by circumstances—rather than by predetermined selection—as to have his work of investigation allotted to him as his daily duty; in the fulfilment of which he is brought face to face with phenomena into which he must inquire, and the result of that inquiry he must faithfully impart. The progress of natural as of moral truth has been and is progressive; but it has pleased the Author of all truth to vary the fashion of the imparting such parcels thereof as He has allotted from time to time for the behoof and guidance of mankind. Those who are privileged with the faculties of discovery are therefore to be regarded as pre-ordained instruments in making known the power of God, without a knowledge of which, as well as of Scripture, we are told that we shall err.”

The words were adduced in attestation of the reliableness of the human mind as the ground of knowledge and the source of truth. Attesting this, they attest still more. They bear witness to the ground of all knowledge and the source of all truth, God, the great primal Mind, the thinking Power of which the universe is the thought. In bearing this witness, they shew you how it is that man's mind is reliable, for man's mind is the offspring of the mind of God. Only that, for the reliable teachings of the human mind, you must resort not to brute hinds, nor to untaught schoolmasters, nor to prejudiced parsons, nor to self-blinded speculators, but to the lights of science; for equally with the Scriptures they are the living oracles of the living God, pre-ordained and prepared to convey his word to man in successive ages, in diverse measures, and with ever growing and expanding light. See, then, how solid is the ground on which you tread hand-in-hand with the scientific interpreters of the universe! Here is certainty—the highest certainty attainable by man; the

same certainty as that on which you buy, sell, lay up treasure, pass from day to day, lie down in your beds at night, and go forth to your duties in the morning. Having ascertained how firm is man's foot-hold in science and religion, let us consider what space of ground it covers. In other words, something is certain; what is that something? In the judgment of science as declared by Professor Owen, what is that something?

That something is God. But in what view? God as the source of man's capacities and as the author of the material universe; God as the ordainer of the relations that subsist between man's faculties and the material universe; God as the allotter of the daily duty of each individual man; God as the giver of such light as individual men draw from the phenomena of the universe in the due exercise and earnest employment of their faculties; God as the benefactor of mankind generally, in that he bestows on them through men of science, his pre-ordained instruments, such truth as in each age he judges best for them to receive. This truth is a revelation of the powers of God, and such a revelation of the powers of God as is not only conducive to human good, but indispensable for human safety. These are certainties, if the chosen oracle of science is to be believed. These certainties are proclaimed to us by one who has a right to be accounted the scientific mouthpiece of the civilized world. Mark the result: these being certainties, God is a certainty, Providence is a certainty; also God's goodness is a certainty, the benign tendency of Providence is a certainty. God, then, is not only the Author, he is also the Father and Friend of the universe, and rules and watches with a special view to the good of the members of his great human family. If we open the Bible and listen to the words of Jesus Christ, we shall find that these teachings of science are identical with his teachings. One of those words will suffice: "Behold the fowls of the air; for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your Heavenly Father feedeth them. Are ye not much better than they?" Science and religion, science and the gospel, then, say the same thing regarding God and Providence. They concur in declaring that God is the Maker and the Father of the universe, and that man is the favoured child of God. Declaring these grand central verities, they implicitly declare all of duty that can make man perfect, and all of hope that can make man happy. Of these grand central verities, what is the essence? God. But in what sense God? God considered as the Author, Governor and Benefactor of the world. This is to say, in other words, that the world owes its existence to a Being who is infinitely wise, good and powerful. Reduced to a simpler form, the declaration is, that mind is the source of all things, and that all things consist in and by intelligence. This mind is not something passive, but an active, creative and directing power. What is

this but to assert that from a benignant Will all things come, and by a benignant Will all things are overruled? That Will, however, is not something abstract—no mere thing, no mere conception, but the self-moving and all-producing power of a Being who is at once in, through and over the universe which is his work, and as his work so at once his throne and his footstool.

Having received these momentous truths from the highest of authorities, I proceed to confront them with some prevalent mistakes and falsities.

And first, there is the falsity of the atheist. The atheist appears in two characters: in the one he boldly and explicitly denies God; in the other he ignores God; now declaring that there is no God, and now declaring that if God is, he has not found God. The second declaration is but a subterfuge to hide the temerity of the first declaration. A rash word truly it is for a being of a few days and narrow experience, limited to a scarcely perceptible point in the boundless universe, to assert that there is no God, that a God is not only a non-existence but an impossibility. The daring presumption has naturally called forth rebuke. As a shield against the weapon, the atheist puts forward the allegation, "If God is, I know him not; let us mind human things and leave divine on one side." Here science steps in and declares her certainties. God is not unknown, but known; not uncertain, but certain; not a problem, but a verity; not a theory, but a fact; and yet not so much a fact as *the* fact—the one fact which lies at the centre of all facts, and makes all other facts possible. The next falsity, admitting a God, identifies God with the universe. This falsity takes several shapes. First it asserts the sufficiency of material causes. One form of matter gives birth to another in ceaseless progression. Here the great difficulty is the initial impulse. Whence that primal birth? Out of nothing comes nothing. But in the way of causation matter is nothing. In other words, the very idea of cause involves the correspondent idea of intelligence. My mind is the spring of all I do. It is not my tongue that speaks, but my mind. The first as well as the last step in every series is ever set by intelligence. From intelligence, then, came the initial step, of which the present moment is a natural and necessary consequence. Accordingly material causes are not sufficient. As not sufficient, they are not the cause of the universe. If material causes exclude mind, they are no cause at all; and if they include mind, mind is at least concurrent in producing the universe. Now in all known cases when mind and not-mind act in combination, mind is the real actor, and not-mind is but instrumental and subsidiary. The real actor, then, that is the sole proper agent, is mind. This fact, declared by science, is equally declared by every one's own experience and every one's own consciousness. Consequently the great agent, God, is intelligence. The uni-

verse is the product, as indeed it is the efflorescence, of mind: it is mind unfolded and displayed. What follows but that all objects are radiations of Divine Wisdom? Accordingly, Professor Owen declares, in words as full of meaning as they are simple, "Every organism is a character in which Divine Wisdom is written."

Another form of the falsity declares the universe an endless series of successions, neither affirming nor denying anything as to the sufficiency of matter. Suns rise and set. Men are born and die. Generations succeed each other—first the fathers, then the sons. Thus it has been, thus it is, thus it will be. Such a notion is simply the abnegation of reason. It is a compound of ignorance and indifference. As such, it never satisfied and never can satisfy any one. It evades instead of solving the question, Whence am I? whence the world?—a question which recurs and recurs again, until it has received some answer,—an answer satisfactory in reality or in appearance. But while the notion is an evasion, it is self-condemned. Pretending to know nothing but what is on the surface, it asserts much of what touches the very kernel of thought. In declaring that as it is now, so was it in the beginning, and so it ever will be, world without end, it declares what with it is a huge and intolerable assumption. How does it know that the present is but the image of the past and the shadow of the future? The fact can be known only on the ground that past and future have their realities and the law of their succession in the Infinite Mind. Atheism is by its very nature bound hand and foot to the present moment. Denying the prerogatives of mind, it is sure of nothing except of its own present existence, and that it would find it easier to assume than to prove. The past may be a dream and the future is a fancy, to the man whose philosophy bids him pronounce the universe exempt from the bands and joints and sequences of intelligence. In direct opposition to this form of atheistic falsehood, Professor Owen repeatedly affirms a Creator, and declares the universe a creation. Mark these his words: "The Cambrian rocks bear the impressed record of creative power. As death is balanced by generation, so extinction has been concomitant with creative power which has continued to provide a succession of species; furthermore, as regards the varying forms of life which this planet has witnessed, there has been an advance and progress in the main" (p. 2). The alleged succession, then, is a mere fancy. It is a fancy because a succession which has no beginning is no succession at all, but a mere word,—an idle, unmeaning sound. But, as a fact, the universe is a creation and not a succession. Nor is this creation a mere evolution. The stream is broken ever and anon. But the interruption is only a pause. The divine energy breaks out in another part, and, as if to manifest its spontaneity and assert its

divinity, it assumes not only a fresh but a higher form. God's free will is proclaimed in the latest discoveries of science.—But here I must advert to a third form of the materialistic hypothesis, "Matter has an inherent power of self-production. See how Mr. Crosse produces animalculæ by mere electrical agencies." Well, suppose that a self-producing power is inherent in certain objects—what then? The question does not the less arise, Whence that power? And until a millstone produces a miller, men will look beyond the rock for what is embedded in or may be brought forth out of the rock. In fact, however, Mr. Crosse's experiments are now wholly disallowed. The old Egyptian fancy of "equivocal generation" is exploded. The true laws of propagation, whether in the vegetable or the animal world, have revealed themselves to science. From a germ of some kind proceed all new-born things. Such, in brief, is the statement made by Professor Owen.

A fourth form of atheistic materialism assures us that we are wrong in speaking of design as manifested in the universe. True, certain parts are convenient for certain uses, but then the use sprang from the part, and the part was not intended for the use. For instance, the duck, finding she possessed a web-foot, took to the water; and the elephant, learning how sensitive and ductile his trunk was, made it serve the joint purposes of a nose and a hand. This theory merely plays at explanation. Affecting to explain all, it explains nothing; for the question remains, Whence the web-foot? and whence the trunk? And if it is right to say that the telescope was designed to enable the eye to contemplate distant bodies, why is it wrong to say that the web-foot was meant for swimming, and that the trunk was designed for smelling and handling? In all human things, use ever denotes design—why not in superhuman things? However, Professor Owen's testimony on this point is express and emphatic. Here, indeed, the services he himself has rendered to science are very great and very valuable. He has succeeded in establishing a new law in the animal world, to the effect that one thought or plan is pursued and followed out in a thousand diverse shapes, the unity of which is found in their use, so that the fin of the fish and the arm of a man are the same organ. Without here entering into particulars, I quote his own general conclusion:

"Three principles are now recognized to have governed the construction of animals:—unity of plan, vegetative repetition, and fitness for purpose. The last alone has of late been questioned; but in reference to such structures as are exemplified by the flood-gates of the heart and the lens of the eye, I find my own powers of conception and expression such as to leave me no other mode of understanding myself or of being intelligible to others, than by using the terms, 'aim,' 'end,' 'purpose' or 'design,' in regard to the relation of the first instanced structure to

the course of the blood in the circulatory system; and of the second to the convergence of light in the act of vision."

We have it then on the word of the highest scientific authority, that there is in creation an aim, an end, a purpose, a design. In consequence, the atheistic controversy is terminated. To affirm a design is to affirm a designer. There can be no purpose without a purposing mind. What but an intelligent being can contemplate an end or entertain a design?

Equally destructive is the Address I have so often cited of a sort of blind and unintentional atheism. Here science itself in its humbler forms is not without blame. Our scientific books of instruction and lecture-rooms are full of two terms, too often atheistic in tendency, namely, "law" and "nature." In certain uses of these terms, everything takes place by "law," and everything is done by "nature." The laws of chemical action produce chemical changes, and nature is ever busy in composing and decomposing bodies in her own laboratory. Sometimes the two terms are combined, and an idol is formed and worshiped under the designation of "the laws of nature."

These forms of speech are not designedly atheistic, at least as employed in education or conversation. They may in part have arisen from a reverent shrinking from the too common use of the name God. Their tendency, however, is to expel the Creator from his works, and to prepare in young minds the way for a practical, if not a speculative atheism. And the danger is not the less because an elaborate work was written by a Frenchman whose object it is to resolve all causes into natural laws. Great, therefore, is the advantage which Professor Owen has conferred on science and religion by employing in his Address the proper terms, *God* and *Lawgiver*. It is high time some authority like his should unteach the schools the perilous shams they have so long employed, and embolden the teachers of science to employ the right words—words that represent the eternal reality with whose utterances and manifestations they deal. The universe is not nature nor nature's work, but God's offspring and God's image. The processes and operations which go on throughout the universe,—shaping, colouring, changing, renewing, improving,—are not laws, but modes of God's own action, goings forth of God's own energy, decrees of the one Supreme Governor, statutes of the all-wise Lawgiver, the economy of the Eternal Mind made outwardly visible to man.

Passages have already been given in which God is recognized as the sole cause of all things, yet I cannot refuse to cite the following words in which my authority refers to the laying of the Atlantic cable—a triumph which he pronounces indubitable, "though more remains to be done before the far-stretching engine can be got into full working order." These are the words to

which I refer: "This first message expressed—'Glory to God in the highest: on earth peace, goodwill towards men.' Never since the foundations of the world were laid could it be more truly said, 'The depths of the sea praise Him'" (p. 15).

The distinct recognition of the Great Lawgiver is found in this beautiful passage:

"To hide from the lightning and tremble at the thunder, as the immediate manifestation of offended Deity, is the superstition of the savage; to recognize that both phenomena are under the control of a law, and operating to beneficial ends, is the privilege of the sage. This it is which begets a true and worthy feeling for the Lawgiver."—P. 10.

Three witnesses combine in one testimony recognizing God's existence and agency—the Human Mind, the Bible, Science;—the universal light embedded in the Soul, the universal light enshrined in the Bible, the universal light displayed in the Creation. These three are one—they are the true "heavenly witnesses," and equally are they the "three that bear witness on earth." If the Human Mind, the Bible and the Creation are wrong or doubtful, farewell truth, farewell certainty. But they are neither wrong nor doubtful. Their "word is truth." Realities themselves, they utter realities, and realities only can they utter.

But if God is, then immortality is; and as man is God's child, so immortality is man's portion and inheritance. "God's child?" "Man God's child?" What a noble privilege! What a grand distinction! But if the position is divine, divine also is the calling. Children of the Heavenly Father, we are required by duty, by love, by gratitude, to hear his word, to follow his guidance, to observe his law, to obey his will, to fulfil his purpose. This, then, is what God says to us in our conscience, in the Scripture, in society, in the universe, "Be ye holy, for I am holy."
B.

A SUCCESSOR OF THE FISHERMAN OF GALILEE.

I WAS but a few feet from the chair of state, on which for the first time the Pontiff was borne. No other court could present so grand and so overpowering a spectacle. In the very centre of the sublimest building on earth, there stood around a circle of officers, nobles, princes, and ambassadors in their dazzling costumes; and within them the highest dignitaries of religion on earth, bishops and patriarchs of the Western and the Eastern Church, with the sacred college in their embroidered robes, crowned by heads which an artist might have rejoiced to study, and which claimed reverence from every beholder.—*Cardinal Wiseman's Description of the Coronation of Leo XII.*

THE "ACTS OF THE APOSTLES."*

IN the preceding paper I affirmed that the purpose of the writer of this book was to vindicate the Pauline view of Christianity, and shew its sufficiency for the salvation of the believer; by giving a history of the ministry of Paul (ch. xiii.—xxviii.), preceded by an introductory narrative (ch. i.—xii.), shewing how that ministry arose by divine appointment out of the ministry of Christ himself. This introductory narrative I shall now analyse, tracing events backward in the reverse order of their occurrence.

The opening of the second part of the work (ch. xiii. 1 seq.) presents to our notice the two missionaries, Barnabas and Saul, whose labours the writer is about to describe, and the church of Antioch, from which they were by the spirit of God sent out. The immediately preceding step was to set forth the previous connection of these Christian labourers with that church and their prominent position in it; and this is done by the account of their mission to Jerusalem to carry thither the proceeds of the collection made in prospect of the famine which had been foretold by Agabus. A step further back is the account of the manner in which they became connected with the church; Barnabas having been sent to Antioch by the church at Jerusalem (apparently under an apprehension that there was something wrong), and having not only devoted himself to the church at Antioch, but fetched Saul from Tarsus to assist him in his ministry there. A yet further step is to the gathering of the church itself, by the missionary labours of certain Hellenistic Jews (Cypriots and Cyrenians) who had left Judea at the time of the persecution, and had preached the gospel to the Greeks,† and so formed the first church that was made up entirely, or nearly so, of Gentile converts. The statement of these particulars was a needful preliminary to the narrative of the great Gentile mission: it extends from ch. xi. 19 to the end of ch. xii.

These particulars were important also in another point of view, as shewing the amicable relations existing between the earliest and greatest community of Gentile Christians and the mother church of Jerusalem, the stronghold of the Judaizing party. Though the purpose of the book was polemical, the spirit of the writer was conciliatory. While anxious to vindicate the freedom and sufficiency of the great branch of the Christian church to which he belonged, he was also anxious not to widen the breach between it and the other (the Judaic) branch, but to exhibit them, where he could, in their amicable relations. In this

* Continued from p. 110.

† Griesbach's reading of "Ελληνας is decidedly preferable to that of the received text, 'Ελλημιστάς.

characteristic the writer shews how completely he had imbibed the spirit of Paul, while he advocated his views. He shews, here and elsewhere, how ready the Gentile churches were to contribute to the relief of Jewish necessities, and how ready the great apostle of the Gentiles was to convey their contributions to his countrymen, to whom he was bound by so many ancient ties.

This preliminary section contains a very remarkable episode, of such interest as, on a cursory perusal, to cast into the shade the narrative in which it is inserted. It is the account of the persecution raised by Herod the king, the martyrdom of the apostle James, the imprisonment and miraculous deliverance of Peter, and the sudden death of Herod, by which the course of the persecution appears to have been stopped (ch. xii. 1—24). The insertion of this episode is very remarkable, and the manner of its insertion is no less so. It has no connection with the writer's purpose, and it stands between these evidently connected passages (ch. xi. 29, 30, and xii. 25): "Then the disciples, every man according to his ability, determined to send relief unto the brethren which dwelt in Judea; which also they did, and sent it to the elders by the hands of Barnabas and Saul." . . . "And Barnabas and Saul returned from Jerusalem, when they had fulfilled their ministry, and took with them also John, whose surname was Mark."*

Now why is this episode, so entirely unconnected with the writer's object (as I regard it), inserted, and that in a manner which so singularly interrupts the narrative? The sole reason, I apprehend, is this. The events it records occurred, as the writer expressly mentions (xii. 1), "about that time," or, as it might be better rendered, "at that time."† Saul and Barnabas were at Jerusalem when these things happened; or, if not at the very time, so soon after, that the impression of the events was still fresh, and the mention of them on the lips of all the brethren. The two delegates of the church at Antioch would, at their return, be full of the subject, as would their attendant, John Mark. The events would thus be communicated to their friends then and afterwards in the connection of time and place in which they occurred; and if the narrative which we have was penned by one of those friends, the notice of these events is naturally accounted for. But such connection, however strongly impressed on the minds of those personally concerned, would have been weakened by each transmission of the narrative, and at length would have failed to hold together parts which have no inherent connection with each other. A compiler a century after the events occurred would hardly have inserted them at all; still less in the remarkable manner in which we find them inserted.

* This notice of Mark is important as preliminary to the subsequent mention of him as the attendant of Paul and Barnabas on their mission.

† κατ' ἐκείνον δὲ τὸν καιρόν.

The account seems to have come from Saul or Barnabas, or from John Mark, and to have been committed to paper, if not by them, by some one so nearly connected with them as to have received directly and strongly the impress of their minds.

But there is another remarkable characteristic of this episode. It relates four events—the martyrdom of James, the imprisonment and intended execution of Peter, his deliverance by a divine interposition, and the stoppage of the persecutions by the death of Herod the persecutor. Of these, the most interesting in itself is the death of James, the first martyr among the apostles, one of those whom our Lord had forewarned that "they should indeed drink of the cup that he was to drink of, and be baptized with the baptism that he was to be baptized with." But this event is recorded in the most meagre way: "And he killed James the brother of John with the sword" (ch. xii. 2). The imprisonment of Peter is recorded with the like brevity. The death of Herod, an event noticeable at all in this history only for its effect in stopping the persecution, and for the remarkable circumstances which gave it so much the appearance of a divine judgment,* is given more fully, but still only with circumstances of public notoriety. The greater part of the narrative relates to Peter's deliverance, and possesses, I think, unmistakeable characteristics of being written by, or at any rate derived from, an eye-witness. The first part is evidently derived from Peter himself; his being roused from slumber, his leaving the prison, his misgiving as to the reality of the circumstances, his realization of their actual occurrence, his deliberation and decision as to where he would go,—all this is given in a way to shew whence the account came; but the description of his arrival during the prayer-meeting at the house of Mary, the sending of the girl Rhoda to hearken, the mention of her name, the effect of her report, Peter's sudden appearance and as sudden departure, are all evidently derived, not from Peter, but from one present at the meeting. Now, where was this meeting held? At the house of Mary, the mother of John Mark, and, as we gather from other passages, the sister of Barnabas. It is most likely that John Mark, and not unlikely that Barnabas, and even Saul, were present, and heard Peter's account of his deliverance at the time. We see, then, how the narrative was derived from sources to which Luke would be likely to have access.

I have dwelt at some length on this episode, because the nature of my argument obliged me to account for its insertion, and because I was anxious to shew the indications contained in it, that it came originally from sources from which Luke would readily derive them.† I return now to my main argument.

* Compare Josephus, *Antiq.*, Book xix., c. viii. 1.

† Let me add here that the view I have taken of the channels through which this interesting account has come down to us, accounts for a circumstance which

In tracing the backward series of connected events, we have come to the foundation of the Antiochene church. But was that church legitimately founded? Gathered from among Gentiles by obscure and nameless individuals, "men of Cyprus and Cyrene," Hellenistic not Palestinian Jews; and regarded by the church at Jerusalem with a jealousy of which the mission of Barnabas was an evidence; was it (to borrow the language of a later date) a true branch of the catholic and apostolic church, or a community at once heretical and schismatic, unworthy of confidence, and unable to secure the salvation of its members? It was desirable to shew that, though not founded by apostolic labours, its foundation was laid upon principles which had apostolic sanction. It was the first church formed of Gentiles admitted to baptism and all other Christian privileges, without circumcision or submission to the Jewish ritual. But Gentiles had been so admitted already, in the person of Cornelius, by the most eminent of the apostles, Peter himself, and that under the express guidance and sanction of the Holy Spirit.

The narrative, then, of the conversion of Cornelius, or rather of the apostolic journey, of which that event was the most striking incident, was essential to the writer's purpose (ch. ix. 32 to the end of x.). Nor was this all. The jealousy which afterwards dictated the mission of Barnabas was so vehement as to call even an apostle to account; and the narrative of Peter's trial (for such it really was) before the church became a necessary adjunct of the account of his journey (xi. 1—18). It was only by a distinct appeal to the Divine direction by which he had been guided, and to the Divine sanction by which his proceedings had been ratified, that even Peter could satisfy the zealous Judaizers that he had acted right. Under an impulse of enlarged and grateful feeling, the assembly, ceasing from all further objection, burst into an ascription of praise to God, that he had "granted unto the Gentiles repentance unto life." The legitimacy of the church at Antioch was thus demonstrated: the principles on which it was founded had been sanctioned by apostolic practice, by the direction and ratification of the Spirit of God, and by the solemn approval of the church at Jerusalem itself.

The portion of the work which, in our backward tracing it, we next come to (ch. ix. 1—31), relates, not to the church by which the missionaries were sent out, but to the more eminent of the missionaries, Paul; and unfolds the history of that wondrous transition by which he became a preacher of the faith he once

has perplexed some critics,—the abrupt disappearance of Peter from the history, in which he appears only once again, and that not prominently (ch. xv. 6, &c.). He must have gone into concealment till Herod's death; and before he could venture to re-appear, Paul and Barnabas would have returned to Antioch, and John Mark would have left Jerusalem with them.

destroyed. He is, indeed, noticed at an earlier period, but only briefly and incidentally: it is in the portion now under notice that he first becomes prominent.

The extension of the gospel, untrammelled by the ritual of the law, to the Gentile world, was, however, only a further development of that liberal spirit which had already broken through the narrow spirit of the more rigid Judaism, and had led to the comprehension of the Samaritan converts made by Philip, the account of whose labours (viii. 4—40) precedes the history of Paul's conversion. But as those labours were determined to that particular field by the expulsion of the Hellenistic converts from Jerusalem in the persecution in which Stephen was martyred, the account of that persecution, and of the zeal and success of Stephen's preaching from which it arose, naturally precedes; and with this is connected the account of the growth of the Hellenistic element in the church, and the consequent appointment of the seven deacons (vi. 1—viii. 3). This was, in fact, a part of that early history of the church at Jerusalem with which the book commences, and which forms the link by which the history given in the Acts of the Apostles is joined to that given in the third Gospel (ch. i.—v.).

In thus tracing the connection of events in the reverse order both of their actual occurrence and of their place in the history, I have simply been adopting the ordinary method of analysis, proceeding from results to causes. Whether, in forming the plan of his history and selecting his materials, the writer followed the same method, is of no consequence. It is enough if we are enabled thus to discern the connection of a history which has seemed to some critics so disjointed and fragmentary. It will, perhaps, render that connection yet more obvious if I just retrace it in the order of the history, dividing the work into what appears to me its natural sections.

The historian begins by tracing, from our Lord's ascension, the early history of the church at Jerusalem, the mother church of Christendom. This we may regard as the first section, ch. i.—v.

The next step is the development of the Hellenistic element in the church, the more liberal spirit of which is indicated by the charge against Stephen (vi. 11—14), and which, by stimulating the intolerance of the unbelieving Jews, brought upon the church the violent persecution in which Stephen fell and the Hellenistic Christians were scattered abroad. The prevalence of this more comprehensive spirit in the church is further evidenced by the labours of Philip in the conversion of the Samaritans, and the apostolic sanction of his proceedings. These form the subject of the second natural section, ch. vi.—viii.*

* The narrative of the conversion of the Ethiopian treasurer (ch. viii. 26—40) is not essential to the writer's object; but it indirectly conduces to it by shewing that the labours of Philip were guided by the Spirit of God, and by tracing the

The history now comes to the extension of the gospel to the Gentiles; and relates, as preparatory to it, the conversion of the destined missionary, Saul; the actual admission of the Gentiles to the church in the person of Cornelius; and the formation of the first Gentile community at Antioch, and its recognition by the mother church at Jerusalem. This constitutes the third great section, ch. ix.—xii.

We meet with only one portion which is not obviously conducive to the writer's purpose,—the episodical narrative of the persecution and death of Herod Agrippa, the introduction of which I have already endeavoured to account for.

We must now turn to the second part of the book, the history of Paul's labours in the mission to which he had been destined; and see how far it accords, in its general character and arrangement, with the view which has been taken of the author's purpose. Paul's mission was really to the heathen world; yet the purpose of the writer was not to contrast Christianity with heathenism, or to establish its truth against heathen arguments, but rather to exhibit the view of Christianity which, in that mission, Paul had held forth, and to establish its validity and sufficiency for the salvation of those who received it, in opposition to the representations of the intolerant, Judaizing party. He desired to allay any apprehensions which Theophilus might feel, and to reassure his mind as to the certainty of the doctrines he had received as true.

And does not this just represent the character of the history? Is it not a history of Paul's conflict, less with the darkness of the Gentile mind, than with Jewish intolerance; of his struggle against that narrowness which, both in the church and out of it, was ever seeking to thwart his labours? With a few exceptions, his chief antagonists and persecutors, as recorded in this book, were Jews. At Philippi and Ephesus, indeed, we have a tempest of heathen intolerance; but elsewhere, at Damascus, in the isle of Cyprus, at Iconium and Lystra, at Thessalonica and Beræa, at Corinth, and in Judea, it is Jewish spite; and even at Ephesus there are indications that heathen wrath was stimulated by Jewish craft. The freedom of the Gentiles from the yoke of the law is distinctly set forth. It was maintained by Paul and Barnabas at Antioch against the zealots who "subverted the minds" of simple believers; it was carried by appeal before the apostles and elders at Jerusalem; and was vindicated by their decision, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and embodied in a circular epistle to the churches, which has been placed on unfailing record

history of that evangelist to his settlement at Cæsarea, where the narrative long afterwards finds him (ch. xxi. 8—10). Let me here observe, that for my perception of some of the steps by which the history proceeds, I am indebted to the valuable suggestions of the lecturer to whom I have referred at the commencement of this paper.

by our author. Whatever conformity to the Mosaic ritual Paul might have practised,—his circumcising Timothy, his vow in Cenchrea, his sacrifice at Jerusalem,—these are shewn to have been simply prudential compliances with opposing prejudices, not recognitions of a bounden duty: and when the great apostle was at length sent a prisoner to Rome, he is set forth as a victim, indeed, yet one whom the favour of God protected amidst all the danger, and comforted in all the affliction, brought on him by that very narrowness of spirit against which the whole book is a protest.

The history, then, is less a general history of the mission to the Gentiles, than of the struggles with Jewish intolerance which that mission involved. It is only occasionally that it presents to us the apostle in immediate contact with the heathen world. Of his recorded discourses, only one, that at Athens (ch. xvii. 22, &c.), was addressed to a heathen audience; unless, indeed, we reckon the brief remonstrance against idolatrous worship addressed to the people of Lystra (xiv. 15, &c.). It may, indeed, be urged that this scanty notice of the conflict with the grosser forms of heathenism is to be accounted for by the direction which the apostle gave to his labours. The part of the Gentile world which was best prepared to appreciate and welcome the gospel, consisted of those who were habituated to attend the worship of the synagogue. In every large town there were many who thus attended, and who, without submitting to the Jewish ritual, without accepting, perhaps, all the facts of the Jewish history, found spiritual nourishment in the sublimity and truth of the Jewish theology, in the noble strains of the prophets and the holy songs of David. They were thus prepared to accept, with ready and joyful faith, a system which embodied in a nobler form, free from Jewish narrowness, all that was valuable and refreshing in the older dispensation. In this class the apostle sought and found his most numerous converts; and to gain access to them, and, at the same time, to offer the gospel to the acceptance of his countrymen, he ever made the synagogue the first scene of his missionary labours.

But while I admit that this will partly account for the course which the narrative follows, it does not by itself sufficiently account for it. The synagogues were open only on the sabbath and on some of the festivals of the Jews; but the apostle did not restrict his labours to these times; and in places where he stayed a long time, as at Corinth (xviii. 6—11) and at Ephesus (xix. 9, 10), he appears, after a short time, to have forsaken the synagogue altogether. Yet of these labours we have little notice, nor can we well account for the omission without adverting to the purpose which the writer had ever in view.

It is well also to notice that he pursues that purpose, not in any spirit of exclusion or disparagement of the Judaic branch of

the church, but simply of resistance to its encroaching and intolerant spirit. Like Paul, the writer reverences in the Jews the ancient people of God; and in the law a divine institution, though not intended for other nations than that to which it was first given. Whether the tendency, which was afterwards so strongly developed in the various Gnostic sects, to distinguish between the Jehovah of the old dispensation and the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, had shewn itself in the apostolic age, cannot now be ascertained. Certainly this book is altogether free from it. There is nothing that could offend the most conscientious Jew, if he did not desire to put the yoke of the law on the necks of the Gentile converts. So general, however, was that desire, and so vehement, that Paul's resistance to it was apparently the principal thing that embittered the opposition which he encountered both from the believing and unbelieving Jews.

Further, the character thus assigned to the book will help to account for some remarkable omissions in it. It is historical or historico-polemical, not biographical; though the writer's purpose unavoidably occasioned him to make Paul the centre of his narrative, so as to give it the appearance of a biography. It is, however, with the mission of the apostle, rather than the vicissitudes of the man, that he is concerned; so that incidents of the deepest personal interest are omitted, if they have no bearing on his object. He tells us nothing of his birthplace, parentage or training; it is only from the incidental mention of them in the apostle's own speeches or in his writings, that we learn them. Of his three years' retreat into Arabia he is silent. I think it is not unlikely that the seemingly abrupt termination of the book is owing to the same cause. The imprisonment of Paul put an end to his public ministry, and with it to the subject of the book. It was no part of the writer's purpose to follow further the history of the man, apostle though he was, and martyr though he came to be. The book was complete for its purpose, to assure Theophilus "of the certainty of the things wherein he had been instructed."*

I have thus endeavoured to ascertain the main purpose of the

* I long held what I believe to be the common opinion, that the abrupt conclusion of the narrative was owing to the writer having brought it down to the time when he wrote; and that we had, consequently, internal evidence of the date at which it was written, viz, the close of the second year of Paul's imprisonment at Rome. A closer examination of the passage has, however, convinced me that the seeming incompleteness of the work did not arise from this cause. The writer does not employ the present tense, as in that case he naturally would have done. He says, *ἔμεινε δὲ διετίαν ὅλην ἐν ἰδίῳ μισθώματι*: he uses *ἔμεινε*, not *μένει*. The two years was an altogether bygone period, not the two years preceding the time of writing. If the cause of the abrupt close of the book was not what I have suggested, it is in vain to conjecture what it was. At any rate, we cannot fix the date of the book so exactly as we could have done had this supposed indication of it been trustworthy.

writer, and to trace the development of it in the progress of the narrative. The statement of that purpose was sought for, first in the prefatory verses of the book, and then, by manifest reference from them, in the introduction to the third Gospel, of which this book is clearly the sequel. That purpose—to assure Theophilus of the trustworthiness of the representation of Christianity which he had received—gives, as I have tried to shew, coherence to the narratives contained in the first twelve chapters, unconnected as they have been thought by some to be; and accounts for the view which the writer has, in the remainder of the book, given of the mission of Paul; looking at it less in its bearing upon heathenism than in its perpetual conflict with Jewish intolerance. How far I have been successful in setting before others the evidence by which the correctness of my view is supported, I cannot say. To my own mind it has been perfectly convincing. I know not, indeed, what other view of its object can be maintained. As a general history of the early church, as a narrative of the labours and sufferings of the apostles, as a biography of Paul, it is manifestly incomplete: it acquires the form and proportions of a digested and completed work, only when viewed as a historical vindication of Pauline Christianity.

But it is this manifestation of its purpose which constitutes the internal evidence of the early date of the book, and of the correctness of the ancient tradition which ascribes it to Luke. It is just the book which would be written by one in the apostolic age and among the followers of Paul, that is, by one living just when and where Luke lived; and it is not suited to the later date to which objecting critics would assign it.

Among the remarkable phenomena in the early history of the Christian church, is the rapid and utter downfall of the Judaizing party. It had tasked the energies of Barnabas and Paul to restrain its intolerance; and the authority of the apostles, wiser than their disciples, was only just sufficient to control its vehemence. But its power and influence, which had threatened the infant church with bondage, passed away as "a tale that is told." When the history of the church emerges from the obscurity which overspreads the period immediately succeeding the apostles' days, the party has all but disappeared. One or two small sects, limited apparently to the Holy Land and its immediate neighbourhood, too remote and secluded to be known except to a few, too insignificant and spiritless to attract notice or to excite fear, formed the sole remnant of what had been once the dominant party in the church. And they had passed away almost without a struggle. Other questions had agitated the church, other parties had shaken it; but the question whether believers in Christ were bound to keep the law of Moses, and the party which contended that they were so bound, were not among them.

There is no great difficulty in accounting for this sudden disappearance, remarkable as it is. In most communities there are limits which any new religious movements soon reach, and beyond which they either do not advance at all, or advance with comparative slowness. The minds which by temperament or training are disposed to receive them, receive them at or soon after their first promulgation. In small and compact communities, which afford facilities for the intercommunication of thought, this is especially the case. It was probably so with the Christian church at Jerusalem, and with the other churches gathered from among the Jews. The church at Jerusalem, at the time of the appointment of the seven deacons, was probably as numerous as when Paul, thirty years afterwards, was seized in the temple by the mob. But in the vastly greater population and less homogeneous composition of the Gentile world, the new faith would not thus early reach its limit. The Gentile branch of the church, which in the days of Paul was almost equalled in number, and perhaps exceeded in influence, by the Judaizing portion, soon outgrew its opponents, and rendered all attempts at its subjugation utterly hopeless. The effect of this on the baffled party would vary with their dispositions. Some, instructed by experience, would be led to more comprehensive views; while those who retained their intolerance would withdraw from the arena of a hopeless conflict, and seclude themselves from contact with those whom they could no longer hope to convince or to constrain.

But the downfall of the Judaizing party, which would, at any rate, have been soon outgrown, was accelerated by two other causes,—the dispersion or death of the apostles and other immediate disciples of Christ, and the destruction of Jerusalem. When the great question had been referred from Antioch to Jerusalem, it was to "the apostles and elders;" and as these passed away from the world, or went to other lands, the authority and prestige of the church there, and of the great party of which it was the stronghold, would be proportionally weakened.* The destruction of Jerusalem was another heavy blow to all Jewish influences. It was a declaration of God, in his providence, against the Jewish people;—the indication that their dispensation had done its work and was to pass away. The observance of many of the requirements of the law was simply impossible: the temple was in ruins, the hierarchy broken up, and the fire on the altar quenched in blood. Tenacity of belief in those who were subject to the law might still be found; but

* It is not unlikely that as the control which the apostles had exercised over the church was weakened by their removal, the intolerance of the Judaizing party increased with its growing weakness. It is remarkable that both James and Paul appear to have given way to this violence in a greater degree at Paul's last visit than on former occasions. (Comp. ch. xi. and xv. with ch. xxi.)

there could be no acquiring new converts to a ritual, compliance with which had ceased to be possible. From this time, proselytes to Judaism and to Judaical observances were rare indeed. The church of Jerusalem migrated to Pella before the destruction of the city and temple by Titus (Euseb. H. E. iii. 5), and the trace of it is soon lost. When, after the subsequent desolation of the Holy Land, occasioned by the revolt of the Jews under Barcohab, in the reign of Hadrian, a church was re-established amid the ruins of the old Jewish capital, it consisted wholly of Gentiles. (Euseb. H. E. iv. 6.)

The great controversy, then, to which the Acts of the Apostles relates, passed away with the apostolic age. In a very few years after that, indeed we may say before the last of the apostles had vanished from the scene; while John was yet impressing on the Ephesian church the lesson of his old age, "Love one another;" perhaps while Philip yet taught at Hieropolis; a defence of Pauline Christianity was no longer required. The mind of Theophilus would hardly then have needed to be reassured. The apologetic literature of the church had turned into another direction altogether; and was devoted to the work of removing heathen ignorance or misconception, and of deprecating heathen intolerance. If some mind, yet lingering in the past, needed to be fortified against influences which, as to the church at large, were bygone; the work of assuring it would have been hardly treated as it is in the Acts, nor would a book on so antiquated a controversy have attracted the attention or obtained the circulation and authority that this acquired. Of the historical books of the New Testament, there is not one which bears more distinctly the impress of the age and source to which the unvaried tradition of the early church has assigned it. The internal evidence accords with the external; and the two leave, I think, no other conclusion open to us than that Luke was the writer.

PREACHING AGAINST FEMALE VANITY DANGEROUS.

ELIZABETH seems to have fancied herself entitled to her supremacy to dispose of bishops as she pleased, though they did not hold commissions *durante bene placito*, as in her brother's time. Thus she suspended Fletcher, Bishop of London, of her own authority, only for marrying "a fine lady and a widow." And Aylmer having preached too vehemently against female vanity in dress, which came home to the Queen's conscience, she told the ladies that if the Bishop held more discourse on such matters she would fit him for heaven, but he should walk thither without a staff and leave his mantle behind him.—HALLAM.

ADDRESS TO THE STUDENTS OF THE UNITARIAN HOME MISSIONARY BOARD, ON QUITTING THE INSTITUTION:

DELIVERED IN CROSS-STREET CHAPEL, MANCHESTER, ON THE EVENING OF
JANUARY 27, 1859.

BY REV. JOHN JAMES TAYLER, B.A.

My Christian friends, my future brethren in the ministry of Christ's holy gospel, to one who stands outside our common work, it may seem strange that I, who am so closely connected with another Institution, should have been asked and have consented to deliver the parting Address to you who are now going forth to active usefulness in the world on the completion of your course of education at the Unitarian Home Missionary Board. My cheerful compliance with the request of your respected Tutors, if it answer no better purpose, will at least serve to express my full persuasion that there is, as there ought to be, no clashing of object and interest between the two Institutions; that, as they have each marked out for them their own peculiar sphere of usefulness,—if they will only keep their aims distinct, and pursue them with a well-defined and steady consistency,—they will be strengthening each other's hands for good—good, it may be, of a different kind, though prompted by one and the same spirit—in that vast field of moral and spiritual labour which is ever opening more widely before the philanthropist and the Christian in this age of enterprize and innovation. But it *does* appear to me essential to our respective means of usefulness, as well as to our mutual help and service, that we should keep clearly in view the distinctness of our objects, and by sticking, each of us, to our proper work, aim with singleness of mind and purpose to do that work earnestly and well. I need not, however, insist on this view of the case, because, I believe, it is generally admitted, and is made by many common friends the ground of the support which they give to both Institutions. It is, moreover, so ably and perspicuously stated in the Prospectus of the “Unitarian Home Missionary Board,” that I think I cannot do better than take a short extract from it, as a kind of text for the few observations which I shall venture to offer on the present occasion.

“The distinctive features,” it is there said, of this Institution “are (1) the limited course of instruction at which it aims, such as can be completed in three years; (2) the advanced age (comparatively) at which it receives its pupils; (3) the union, through their whole course, of active practical labours with daily study. By such means it is attempted to send forth men, who embrace the task of Christian missionaries solely because they love it,—who are practically acquainted with the wants of the humbler classes, and have some experience in meeting them,—who are prepared for their work by suitable theological and general knowledge,—who are popular in their spirit, their style of preaching,

and their general mode of operation,—and who, above all, are imbued with that deep love of God and Christ, which best displays itself in labours of love among mankind. The objects of the Institution are to prepare men of earnest and devout minds to be domestic missionaries, Unitarian missionaries, and ministers to rural and other small congregations.”

Such, my friends, in the earnest language of its founders, is the object of the Institution which you are about to quit. Such is the work for which it has trained you, and to which it now sends you forth. If I understand its spirit correctly, it has trained you to be messengers of Christian peace and hope and joy to the hearts and homes of the poor—to comfort and encourage, with words of heavenly grace and power, the sons and daughters of humble toil. It sends you forth to break up new fields of spiritual husbandry, and to carry a fresher and a brighter gospel—a gospel fresh from the well-springs of faith in your own hearts, and bright with the truth of Christ himself, undimmed by our human traditions—to those myriads of uncultivated but manly and healthy intellects, who are awakening everywhere, at the touch of a new civilization, to the consciousness of their latent powers, and demanding a religion more in harmony with their native sense of mercy and right, and more commensurate to the spiritual needs of their daily life. Such a ministry may be different—in some respects must be different—from that which is exercised in great cities among the refined and educated classes of society. It is a different, but it is in no sense an inferior, ministry. It has the closest affinity with that which originally evangelized the world; and as it has a work, so it requires a culture, of its own. It must keep true and faithful to its great object, and make all its preparatory study and discipline subservient to it—that of preaching the gospel to the simple-minded and the poor—that of rescuing vast outlying masses of humanity from spiritual apathy and death, and bringing them within the quickening influences of a true Christianity. And it must keep what it has so gained; where it does not find, it must create and perpetuate, a church; and under those healing influences which go forth from every genuine church, it must infuse into many an humble home that ineffable peace of God, that silent blessing of Christ, that spirit of patient, gentle love, of respectful courtesy, of indwelling refinement of heart and life, which ever wait on the ministrations of a true and living gospel, which make a moral paradise wherever they alight, and, to the eye which looks below the surface to the reality of things, almost efface the harsher distinctions of human society. My friends, it is to this holy and beautiful ministry that you are specially called. Amidst the false estimate of things which so widely prevails—amidst the slavish worship of wealth and worldly position and great names—feel, I beseech you, its intrinsic nobleness and worth. The

self-consecration which it involves is the true baptism of the spirit. The self-sacrifice which it will require, is the best exemplification of the great doctrine of the Cross. I wish I could make you feel how deeply I honour your proper work, and how completely you carry with you into it the warmest sympathies of my heart.

Allow me to allude to one or two points in which it seems to me the strength and value of your special ministry are particularly concentrated, and in earnestly dwelling on which you may, I think, render very great service to the world. Go to your work, then, in the first place, with a strong faith that there is a seed of indestructible religiousness latent in every human soul, though it may often be buried deep under loads of heavy formalism and sensual apathy. Never doubt for one moment that it is there; and that if you watch your opportunity, and search for it with gentle, reverent hand, you will find it in its darkest nook, and bring it out; and by letting the soft influences of gospel light and love flow in upon it, stimulate it into new action, and expand it into a broader and a stronger life. Never despair of the most fallen, sunken, wretched, to the eye of man most helpless and desperate, soul. It is still formed in the image of God; and that image, however sullied and defaced, is wrought of immortal substance and cannot be destroyed. But, secondly, as there is religion in the soul of every man, so is there religion pre-eminently and before all things in the Bible. The whole Bible is steeped in the essence of religion. The brightest elements of pious trust and heavenward aspiration which lie dim and scattered amidst a mass of grosser materials in human souls, are collected in an intense focus in the Bible—especially at its centre-point, the person, work and word of Christ—and are thence thrown back on our cold and dark carnality with a vivifying heat and a kindling effulgence. It is this correspondence of the religion of the Bible with the religion of the human heart—of the richness and fulness of the one with the thirsting and faintness of the other—which brings them into such close and intimate relationship, and makes them, as it were, the mutual complements of a common unity—makes faith in the grand, fundamental truths of the Bible, a sort of spiritual necessity to the inward nature of man, against which neither the perverseness of heresy nor the restless destructiveness of scepticism can ever in the long run prevail. Now, I say to you, my friends, with the deep interest of one who claims to be in some degree a partner with you in your work, and feels all its worth and greatness,—preach earnestly, preach plainly and directly, with all the fervour and simplicity of convinced and believing minds, the grand, solemn, awful, consolatory religion of the Bible—urge it home to the conscience, imprint it on the heart, infuse it into the life, of your hearers. Do not confound it with the human theologies that have been

heaped on it. More or less and at various depths, it underlies them all; and not one of them has yet expressed its full meaning or brought out all its strength. Do you ask, what I mean by the religion of the Bible? Dismiss your creeds and your systems of whatever school; come with a pure, simple, open mind; and you will find it written in broad and unmistakeable characters on the open page of that venerable book, which your own soul will at once interpret into the highest significance. I do not say, that there are not texts that will puzzle the adherents of any theological system; but if your search is for religion—religion which purifies the heart and ennobles the life, which humbles and sanctifies the soul, which fills it with the spirit of earnest duty, of patient trust, of devoted and self-sacrificing love—that you will find without difficulty, shining clear and open as the light of day in the work and word of Christ, and reflected with feebler but no obscure radiance from the preachings of prophets and apostles, the songs of psalmists, and the examples of pious and holy men in every chapter of its varied narrative. And it is religion which you want, the religion of the conscience and the heart, the religion which is reflected from the broad surface of the Bible, and not the refinements of scholastic divines, for the spiritual nourishment of the multitude. If at times they should press you with difficulties, you can refer them to the obvious and convincing principle, that what God intended for their guidance, must be the clear, not the dark parts of scripture, and that the dark must ever be interpreted by the clear, not the clear be confused and muddled by the dark.

How emphatically the Bible speaks to the deepest needs and spiritual yearnings of our nature! Its grand doctrines no one who is in earnest and comes unbiassed to their search, can possibly mistake. So long as we stand on these, our position is unassailable. Do we feel our own dependence and insufficiency? What an answer of truth do we find in the grand assurance, that there is one God, underived and omnipresent, the Maker of heaven and earth, the righteous Judge and merciful Father of all men! Is there a voice within, which tells us of an eternal and uneffaceable distinction between right and wrong, between truth and falsehood? How is that solemn instinct of our being justified and confirmed by the doctrine, that the All-holy has written his laws on our hearts, and commanded us to obey them! When the conflicts and miseries of life appal us, and the world seems lapsing into one huge chaos of moral confusion, how are we sustained by the belief which every page of scripture inspires, that the Just and Holy One has laid the foundations of a kingdom of truth and righteousness on earth, which He will never suffer to be overthrown by all the violence and wickedness of men, and which He has predestined in his irreversible counsels to overcome all opposition, and to establish itself in triumphant

universality at last! We groan under the weight of sin. We are conscious that it cuts us off from peaceful communion with God, and darkens the light of the Divine presence in our souls. We are bound in the chains of habit, and feel ourselves helpless to cast them off, and are ready to perish in despair. O how welcome is the appearance of a Redeemer among us, who once more bids us be of good cheer, who takes the load from our souls, and brings us the promise of help and forgiveness! A virtue goes forth from the fulness of Divine love that dwells in him, and kindles a new life in us. The quickening touch of his spirit makes us new creatures. Out of the dark, deep gulf in which we were perishing, he draws us upward, by the strong attraction of a divine sympathy, into the purer air of a religious consciousness, and we live and breathe again, and behold from afar the Father's house from which we have wandered so long. Then, again, in our better moments we yearn with a deep brotherly affection towards all mankind, though the world's law of exclusiveness is against us, and the antipathies of race and sect and class are still rife in the earth. How rejoiced we are to set up a better law against the law of the world, and to hear that voice from heaven which tells us that we are all made of one blood, that we are all members of one great family, which has a common origin and destiny, on which rests a common duty, and to which comes a common invitation from above to hope, aspire and trust! There comes at last the great mystery for us all—the solemn transition from light into darkness. And to the unsealed eye of man, how great is that darkness! As the unbeliever stands beside the open grave, he looks down into nothingness. Yet even in the dark, blank void of his doubting soul, you will often discern a faint and trembling point of light, waiting as it were for some friendly breath to fan it into a broader and steadier flame. Here is the point of contact between our human weakness and the heavenly strength. Here faith encounters a kindred element and nurses it into life. Next in power to the divine instinct which leads us to God, and grasps with eagerness the gospel assurance that He is our Father, is that deep longing of the soul for one clear, authentic whisper from the world unknown—one word of intelligence and recognition from the land of unbroken silence to which the loved and honoured of our souls have irrevocably passed. How, then, does Christianity respond to our deepest wants, our holiest necessities, in the voice of him who spake as never man spake, when it tells us of the many mansions where he has gone to prepare a place for us in his Father's house! How are we awed at once and comforted by its solemn record, that when he passed away from earth, he gave to those whom he left behind some sure, though to us mysterious and inexplicable, proof that he was with them still, present to their inmost life, the tenant of an unseen but more glorious world!

This, my friends, as I understand it, is the religion of the Bible and the religion of human nature—the religion of Christ, who is the ideal and consummation of human nature. Preach this religion earnestly and affectionately; and my belief is, you will not want scientific proofs and learned defences to recommend it; my belief is, that adapted as it is to the deepest wants of our nature, it will find its own best evidence in the spontaneous witness borne to it by every healthy mind and honest heart; and there is enough of religion, of the natural awe, reverence and trust which it carries with it, left in the hearts even of the dissipated and the wicked, to make them feel the force of this evidence, if you can once induce them to reflect and compel them to be serious. I may be thought singular in my opinion, but I am not, I confess, in favour of engaging the popular mind in the perplexed and difficult questions of doctrinal theology. And my reason is this. Such questions to be thoroughly handled and satisfactorily disposed of, require a great deal more minute and recondite knowledge than the mass of persons, constantly engaged in other pursuits, could possibly acquire or be made readily to comprehend; and such questions, if they cannot be gone into thoroughly and satisfactorily, had better not be gone into at all. The whole history of the church shews the mischief of giving prominence to such questions, and making them matters of popular discussion. They foster a spirit of unfruitful disputatiousness, without cherishing the love either of God or man. They neither enlighten the popular mind nor improve the popular heart. A theological people is a very different thing from a religious people. The theology of the age, even its learned theology, as your Tutors, I doubt not, have often told you, is daily to its own great advantage becoming more religious. It would be a movement in the wrong direction, if the popular religion were to become in the same degree more theological.

I must not be misunderstood. I know what keen intelligence, what a love of knowledge, what a spirit of earnest inquiry, often exists in persons of the humblest classes, especially in this part of the kingdom; and I should be the last to discourage freedom of thought and the search for information in any one—the last to throw any obstacles in the way of acquiring a faith as perfectly intelligent and well-grounded as it is in the power of the individual to make it. I think, moreover, it will be one of the most important duties of your future ministry, to make the people whom you gather round you well acquainted with the Scriptures, and to communicate to them rational notions of their origin, nature, authority and proper use, accompanied by such antiquarian, historical and geographical knowledge, as may render the reading of them intelligible and delightful. It will be a less constant, but it may at times be an equally necessary, duty for you, to defend the privileges of your Christian freedom, and the

views of Christian truth which you have acquired in the exercise of it, from prejudiced and ignorant assailants. And for both these objects—the daily instruction of your people as well as the occasional defence of the truth committed to you—I feel sure, from the course of study which you have gone through in this Institution, and from my long acquaintance with the learning and accomplishment of my old and valued friends, your Tutors, that, if you have at all adequately profited by your advantages, you will go forth into the world well prepared. What I mean is this: that both in defending the truth and in your ordinary teaching of Christianity, your main reliance must always be less on the learning of books, than on the support which is given to the essential doctrines of the gospel by the strong native sense and healthy moral instincts of the popular mind; and that if questions should at times come across your people, into the whole depth and breadth of which you find it impossible, with their present and attainable knowledge, to introduce them, you had better tell them plainly that it is so. It is better they should remain in ignorance than be plunged into hopeless perplexity. It is good for all of us—professed teachers and scholars no less than the rest of mankind—a part of the humbling, chastening discipline of this life—that we should learn there are some things that we cannot know, because they do not belong to our proper sphere of thought and action, and our proper employments do not leave us the necessary time to acquire them. To know where to be ignorant, and why we must be so, is no small part of wisdom. All the knowledge that concerns our inward peace, our conduct in this life and our preparation for the future life—all that constitutes true wisdom—lies within reach of every one; for it rests on that highest evidence which the soul itself supplies, which is confirmed by the universal reason and witnessed by the common heart and conscience of man, and results from that variegated experience which we must all pass through in our journey from the cradle to the grave. This, my friends, is the wisdom which it must be your chief object to impress on the popular mind and infuse into the popular life.

I have detained you long, but before I close I would just say two words on another subject. You are specially called to minister in that class who are emerging from ignorance and awakening to the consciousness of their social position and its connected claims and opportunities. The future of our country depends in no small degree on the moral direction given to the energies and aspirations of this class. Look to their homes, then. Try to infuse into them the refining and tranquillizing influences of mental culture and domestic affection. Home furnishes the citizen. On the preservation of the sanctity of our homes, hangs the decision of the great question, whether we shall survive to future generations a race of manly, honest, free men, or break out

into lawless licence, to be crushed at length by an iron despotism. Try to make your people not only good Christians, but, what must ever be the fruit of a true Christianity, good Englishmen also. Let a generous and enlightened patriotism, founded on reason and nourished with knowledge, grow up and mingle with their piety. Attach them to their country, to its history, to its constitutional liberties, to its literature. Of all the means of elevating the moral tone of a people, I can think of none, next to the Bible, more certain and direct than an acquaintance with the history and literature of their country. Here you have a wide and most delightful field of influence and instruction opened before you. Good books are now accessible and cheap. So excite the curiosity and form the tastes of your people, that you may see the fruits of your influence not only in a well-filled classroom and an attentive audience, but in the wise and sober spirit which you observe prevalent in the discussion of political and social questions, and in the new interest and refined delight which you find the historian or the poet shedding on the long winter's evening at the fire-side of many a humble home. Why should not every class become well acquainted with the country of their birth, be familiar with its great traditions, and honour its distinguished names? Let the poorest know something of the long struggles and the various fortune through which our country has achieved its liberties, and wrought out its peculiar form of civilization, and won for itself a mighty name in the earth; let them feel the dulness of their daily life brightened at times by a flash from the wit, the eloquence and the imagination of its great writers and speakers. Depend upon it, their hearts will swell with an honest pride—a pride that must exert an ennobling influence on their conduct and their life—when they think of themselves as the descendants of men whose manly voice and firm arm successively won for them the largest share of practical freedom ever yet enjoyed on earth,—when they remember that they are dwellers in a land and the speakers of a language, which Shakespeare and Milton, Bacon and Locke, once called their own.

To these high duties, these manifold opportunities of social usefulness, you now go forth, my friends. Encounter them under a solemn sense of your responsibilities to God. Feel the possible extent of their spiritual influence, the whole amount of their possible bearing on the virtue and happiness of immortal souls. Contemplate them all, whatever they may be, in a religious light, with the earnest desire to make this world more Christian in its aim and its action. Consecrate yourselves unreservedly to God. Look singly to the work which He has set before you, and, as in his sight and for the good of his creatures, resolve to perform it well. In perfect singleness of mind and simplicity of purpose you will find the truest inspiration of your ministry, the secret of its success and of your own inward con-

tentment and peace. And now, friends and brethren, fare ye well! God speed you in your work! His silent blessing render fruitful for good to thousands whom you cannot see and may never know, every faithful word you utter, every labour of love in which you engage, every prayer for wisdom and strength, which goes up in secret to Him. I have no more to say. Once commended to Him, who is all our wisdom and all our strength, you want no words of mine. You are best left alone with the silence of your own thoughts.

ADDRESS OF EDMUND POTTER, ESQ., TO THE STUDENTS OF THE HOME MISSIONARY BOARD, AT THE CLOSE OF THE RECENT EXAMINATIONS.

I ADDRESS those who have been engaged in secular occupations, but who from a desire of change, created by wishes of the highest class and motives of an unselfish character, have chosen another walk in life, from mature thought and conviction and a desire of practical usefulness. The fitting education for your new and arduous occupation is, I am satisfied, afforded by the Home Missionary Board, and further guaranteed by the intellectual power and warm devotion to your progress by your kind and attentive Professors. You have, I believe, availed yourselves by close and attentive study of these advantages, and some of you now leave the Institution for another and a wider sphere of duty and usefulness, either as missionaries in our town districts or as preachers in charge of congregations, and I hope also as missionaries to a certain extent. To those whose more immediate duties are those of the missionary in our manufacturing districts, I will mainly address myself.

You, like myself, are not strangers to the class amongst whom you are going forth. You know their homes, their habits, and are able from previous knowledge to form your own conclusions as to the best means of infusing into them a reforming and civilizing agency, and with it also that religious faith which alone can consolidate your efforts. Two classes will present themselves at once prominently to you in your districts—the poor from necessity and the poor from their own vice and thoughtlessness. The first of these classes, the present prosperity, demand for labour and cheapness of provisions, will naturally tend to lessen; and it is most desirable that during the continuance of such a period, principles of economy, forethought and such education as is practicable, should be enforced, if not as a precaution against future sorrow, as a stepping-stone and foundation for any improvement. Looking, then, to our more immediate neighbour-

hood, I believe, if rightly used by the community—I mean by those of us who have means either economically or religiously—at no period during the memory of those now living have such chances of substantial improvement amongst the lower classes presented themselves. We know how poverty, how despondent hopelessness and its consequent recklessness, fill our streets and our jails; and how, when decent poverty has once sunk below its own low state and lost caste, dear to it and often clung to as tenaciously as amongst their betters, how difficult, how exceedingly difficult, it is to revive the power of independence and self-respect. Through your exertions many may now be redeemed, whilst the chances of regular employment brings at least means of decent subsistence. Amongst this class will be your best-received labours, and here your words of practical advice will bring forth the quickest return; here cleanliness and regular habits may prepare the way for the reception of religious instruction and comfort. Perhaps in no shape can the missionary better aid than in lifting this very lowest class (often the really virtuous—at least, if not virtuous, sinful almost by the overwhelming force of circumstances) from the depths of despair. Your sphere of usefulness is extensive; at present, I believe, it will be the most cheering field of your labours. I wish it were possible to bring greater extent of power to bear upon it now, with so good a seed-time. I wish it were possible to sectionize the whole of a large town like our own, and carry through each division an investigation into the position of each of its lower classes, and try if, while brighter days shine upon us, deeper practical lessons could not be enforced. I know no better means of really carrying out such a suggestion than through the home missionary. Without making one illnatured remark, or in any way depreciating the much more extensive exertions of other classes of religionists, worthy in many points of all imitation on our part, I cannot help expressing the opinion that more practical good, and consequently ultimately more religious good, may be accomplished by teaching and inculcating first and most prominently the duties of cleanliness, sobriety and worldly forethought,—this first duty, in my mind, affording the most direct means of the missionary's entrance, without being obtrusive, into the homes of the poor. Here must be laid the foundation for his higher instructions; and very kindly, very thoughtfully and prudently, must his services be offered to the poor and the needy, though still ever capable of being elevated to the highest dignity of human beings and fellow-creatures.

Amongst this section, then, of our poorer brethren your labours will be those most welcomed and of highest hope and quickest reward. Your difficulties here will, however, in some degree be increased by our present prosperity, and by the contamination and affinity with those of a very different and much more difficult

section to deal with—I mean those who make themselves poor by their ignorance, imprudence, bad habits and consequent vices, and their want of that power of forethought and prudence which might, with very small resolution on their part, lift them now, in the days of comparative prosperity, out of their present position into independence. You will find it very difficult to impress upon this class the necessity of prudence, from many causes; first, perhaps, from too great a reliance upon the continuance of their present ample wages, which, if not higher in rate, are imperceptibly increased by cheap provisions, clothing, means of amusement, locomotion and cheap literature; many of these things are very great temptations to expenditure, and the ample and regular income is too often thoughtlessly expended, and the investment for future wants and for the honest independence of old age completely neglected. The difficulty of inculcating forethought in the day of prosperity is great amongst all of us; in no class would its lessons tell more rapidly or more beneficially than in the one I refer to. I need hardly dwell upon the amount of worldly shrewdness possessed by this class, sharpened of late years by growing education, by the cheap papers, by the cheap literature of the day, and by the means of cheap travel. I need not say how many from this class do rise to jostle out by their energetic competition those in the higher ones, and how they do continually supply much of that practical energy which by its industry surmounts many difficulties, and often secures for its possessor no small share of worldly prosperity.

These two classes, then, to my mind constitute, with shades from each, the mass to which your arduous labours will be more particularly directed,—difficult indeed to attempt, except by the aid of that deep faith which alone can lead and guide you through man's created wilderness of poverty and vice. Your field of duty is indeed wide, but not irreclaimable; you know the means of reclamation. Perhaps, then, you will hear from me a few words on what I may consider your best means of fitting yourselves for your sphere of usefulness and gaining your needful qualifications. I address those who have known something of the struggles of life and whose paths have not been altogether smooth, and who may have known the benefit of that education which nothing but early difficulties and struggles can give—difficulties often overcome by that perseverance and hard experience which teaches us to look upon the failings of others with pity and upon their social success with gladness. You seek the means of usefulness and of power to minister amongst those needing aid, and rightly have concluded that the resolution you have formed to devote yourselves to missionary labours can be best aided by solid, systematic education. That education may not now be so easily acquired as in that period in life when the suppleness of memory is able, if its possessor be willing, to grasp almost any

amount of acquirement. So much time is not yours, but still great means *are* within your reach; you know their value, you work as those redeeming the time, with a consciousness that it is all short enough. If you are at present perhaps chiefly engaged in the acquisition of the more solid study needful for your theological duties and fitness, the systematic training you will gain will give you an easier power of acquirement in many branches of study you may wish hereafter to pursue.

I have spoken of the class amongst whom your labours will be most difficult, and most so perhaps at present, in this their day of comparative prosperity. To minister amongst them you will need all the power education can give; they will despise an ignorant man; I am certain they *do* despise irreligious men. They of course are too often wanting in early education; some little early piety they may by chance have imbibed, smothered now perhaps by rude energy and the material pursuits of life. You will find many of them strong in mere practical, worldly education, the natural result of contact and discussion in the work-shop, or perhaps in the beer-shop and reading-room. Many do possess a healthy mental organization, which might be rapidly developed by more frequent intercourse with those who could, from knowledge of the class itself, ingratiate themselves with them. They are eager for information on all subjects, most naturally on political, and on mechanical or chemical subjects, according to the nature of their employments. They think deeply on such questions, and may be best approached through their own particular tastes; but it must be by their superiors, by those possessing, or being able to furnish or recommend to them, means of sound and accurate knowledge.

Here, then, you have oftentimes a practical foundation to work upon. I have great faith in direct influence through the natural tastes of the workman. We in our own classes are feeling very sensibly the progress of education, and the improved feeling consequent upon it. This may be soundly aided through the home and religious feelings. I cannot help thinking that amongst this class our peculiar religious views carry with them a singular adaptation. They are simple, practical and liberal; we do not condemn others; we are not exacting; we do not expect agreement on every minute point; we offer them simply to their consideration; and, as sufficient for guiding us all, we think, through the difficult and intricate paths of life, we cling to them because they seem to us founded on faith and works, and upon hope and charity. They enable *us* to work, except in matters of speculative religious opinions, with the Protestant, Catholic or the Jew, or even beyond that with those who may be so unfortunate as to possess no religious faith, and we think by working with them and for them, our deeds may aid the progress of our opinions. Perhaps I am dwelling too long and too diffusively on this parti-

cular point, and on your fitness for your work and for success amongst this class.

I would urge you, then, yourselves to cherish refining tastes, feelings and studies. The deep influence of real refinement, grounded on knowledge, has its weight on every class. It will aid you specially in your own; for I would press upon you, though it may be difficult for you—poor, it may be, among the wealthy—to mix whenever it is possible with the upper classes. You will always carry with you the respect due to your profession, when adorned with quiet worth, solid piety and the learning even now within your grasp. You have more simple desires and wants, and thus, by the limitation of wishes, you may still be wealthy amongst the rich. I ask you, don't shun the means of coming amongst your wealthier acquaintances. I do not fear that you will neglect the means of being acquainted with the poor and needy.

Some of you may occupy pulpits in our increasing manufacturing towns and districts, amongst healthy and vigorous populations. To you, then, my latter observations may more particularly apply. Classes are not so divided as in larger towns, and the pastor who ministers amongst the people is more likely to associate with all classes, as he will find few, if any, of the higher who have not recently sprung from the workmen, and whose sympathies for them are not yet rendered callous by conventional pride, ambition or class feeling. Your missionary labours in many such districts will be comparatively light; they will be the means of adding to your congregations many of the well-doing from the working classes; amongst them you will find steady, earnest and thoughtful coadjutors.

I am aware, in giving you my opinions on your own course, I lay myself and my own class open to claims from you of support and assistance. I admit it. I know how difficult, how more than difficult, it is to the man of refinement and modesty, such as I know exists amongst your class, to remind the wealthy and well-doing how poorly he is supported. Let him, however, tell them of the interspaces in society which in his daily walks in life are presented to him, forming so many continual stagnant morasses of vice and misery, and into which he can scarcely venture for the want of support; or, if he do so venture, returns from the hopeless exploration dispirited and worn out. It is good for us repeatedly to be brought to the admission that we are neglecting *our* duties; and nothing perhaps could better remind us than more frequent meetings with those who do do their duty by facing it. Qualify yourselves, then, by education and by association with, whenever possible, those of us in the wealthier walks of life, and you will then often find means of reminding both rich and poor of their duties,—more imperative though less felt, it may be, in the upper than the lower ranks.

I ask you, then, to receive kindly and weigh favourably the somewhat crude thoughts which have suggested themselves to my mind, and to go forth to your labours strong in the faith which has induced you to undertake them.

RISE AND PROGRESS OF THE RELIGIOUS REFORM COMMUNITIES OF GERMANY.

I LEFT Laurahütte, the place of my first exile, in the commencement of November, 1844, and was invited to Breslau by my friends, as there were a considerable number of liberal Catholics who had been greatly offended by the exhibition of the holy coat, and who were ready to separate from the Roman Church. It was at the end of November when I arrived at Breslau, where I was received with enthusiasm, and presented, on the part of a great many towns of Germany, with addresses, in which I was requested to organize a German Catholic church. No other part of Germany could be better prepared for the formation of Catholic Reform communities than Silesia. At the time of the Protestant Reformation, Silesia became as to three-quarters of its inhabitants Protestant; but being retained by the Hapsburgs after the war of thirty years, the Protestants were greatly oppressed; and it was from the ill-treatment which the Protestants experienced that Frederic II., or the Great, of Prussia, was able to wrest that province by conquest from Austria, and make it one of the keystones of a Protestant state in Germany, in opposition to the Hapsburgs, at the time the emperors of Germany. Without the support of the Protestants, who formed the more cultivated and influential portion, and without a political reform movement in that province, Frederic II. could scarcely have succeeded; and it was just this which induced him to invade Silesia, supported also by the sympathies of the enlightened part of the German nation. This fact it seems Thomas Carlyle has not sufficiently valued in his *History of Frederic II.* As the number of Catholics and Protestants was nearly equal, and the Protestants had always to repel the attacks of the plotting Catholic bishops and to keep up theological discussion with the Catholic priests, it could not fail that both parties advanced in religious culture, and that they prepared the field for religious reform.

Breslau, the capital of the province, with about 110,000 inhabitants, was naturally the centre of the theological and literary combats of both parties. There are only 30,000 Catholics in Breslau; but they have a cathedral and a bishop, who has the title, Prince Bishop of Breslau. It will be easily understood by the reader that no town could be better prepared for and more favourable to the commencement of this new Reform movement

than Breslau, especially as the Catholic chapter had endeavoured to bring Catholic professors into the University, and they themselves had continually to engage in defence of their Church. Two of the University professors—the well-known naturalist, Nees, of Esenbeck, and Dr. Regensbrecht—and likewise some of the most influential Catholic citizens, even among the magistrates and the representatives of the town, joined after my arrival. The Catholic chapter was struck with terror, and the greater number of them prepared at Christmas for flight, fearing a revolt. More distressing than this was the news that a great number of Catholic parish priests, with their flocks, intended to separate from Rome, waiting only if the Prussian Government would guarantee them the parish property on their leaving the Church of Rome. If the Prussian Government had not been in the hands of a Puseyite party, guided by the Jesuits, who influenced the Queen, a Catholic princess of Bavaria, the whole movement would have taken greater dimensions, and in Silesia we should have seen one-half of the Catholics, with their priests, joining the Reform movement. But there was no Frederic II. on the throne of Prussia, who understood how to make use of such a popular movement for the benefit of Germany and Europe, and we had to find our way unprotected by any Protestant Government, and persecuted by the Catholic princes and the whole machinery of the Catholic hierarchy.

I myself was young, inexperienced, and little acquainted with the political powers I had now to deal with. However, I was well aware of the utter rottenness of the Catholic hierarchy, and clear as to the fundamental principles and the leading ideas of the new Reform movement. Thus I set to work to organize the first Reform community, being supported by the press, the citizens and the sympathies of the enlightened portion of the nation. The first Reform meeting I held the 21st of January, 1845, in the hall of the representative body of the town, in dem Stadt-Verordneten Saal. The crowd was immense, and two officers of the army stood by my side ready to repel any attack of a Catholic *émeute*. I would have commenced in December, 1844, but was kept back by one portion of the Reform party, who wanted to make a demonstration against the chapter by directing an address to them, supposing that in this way they should enlist a greater number. But the Catholic hierarchy are better diplomatists; and they only wanted to gain time to recover from the blow they had received. Instead of giving an answer to the Catholic gentlemen who had signed the address, they calumniated them secretly and openly. But this portion of the liberal Catholics were more for a demonstration than for action; and I mention this, as I have found the same mistake repeated in many towns, and last year again in Amsterdam. If a Reform movement in the English State Church should commence, the same experiment will be

made. I waited only a few weeks and then joined with more active men, prepared a list for signing the names, and had every week one or two public meetings and private ones of a select committee.

In order to give a clear insight into the substance of our movement, I have to state what my convictions regarding theology were:—the pervading presence of God, or the idea that God pervades the universe, and that there is harmony in the universe, not an antagonism of God and world, or of spiritual and material power. This conviction guided most of those who joined the first Reform community, and thus my proposals were according to this conviction. The foundation and source was, then, the belief of *one God*, not of a Trinity. Being convinced that mankind, like the world, emanate from God, we placed the doctrine of the “free dignity of man” in the constitution, and respect for individual convictions and the right of private judgment. The latter was the result of Protestantism, but we based upon it the principle of the equal rights of all members, and framed the organization of the community accordingly. The community at large was the source of all powers; they elected a representative body, and this again an executive committee, called presidents (*vorstand*). The preachers and teachers are also elected by the community at large, after they have passed the prescribed examinations. The rights and duties of the representatives are defined according to the fundamental principle of the community, and they have to give every quarter reports and render accounts. The resolutions of the synods and councils, in so far as they concern the individual community, must receive the approval of the latter before they become binding upon them. Having no dogma of an offended God who requires the blood of his Son for reconciliation with man, we did not want the mediation of a priesthood, and every shadow of priestcraft disappeared. All members contribute, according to their power, to the moral and spiritual stock or the religious substance of the community, and continual progress in religious culture is not only a right but also a duty, and did not depend on the preacher alone. The whole community is thus a priest, and every member, in the highest sense of the word; and the chief question at the end of the year is, what and how much has *been done* by the community? not simply, how many sermons have been delivered? In order to call forth in the new members the feeling and consciousness of this duty, and to raise a noble confidence and self-reliance, I did not attempt myself to settle the various articles and rules of the church, but proposed article after article and discussed them. Every one was thus a reformer, and all worked in harmony, although we might differ as to minor points and opinions. This it was my duty to secure; it was also necessary, looking to the struggles which we had to expect. In taking at every meeting only a few

points, the members had time for reflection, and they advanced therefore to greater maturity. Being in the chair, I had sometimes no easy task, especially as the Catholic chapter did not fail to send their messengers, and certain orthodox Protestant priests hoped to bring in the creeds and doctrines of their Church. However, we succeeded at last, and the fundamental principles were carried. Every member considered himself responsible for the maintenance and the realization of the principles he had voted for, and in this conviction consists the chief power of our Reform communities. They have proved this during the period of ten years' oppressions and persecutions by the Catholic and Protestant priesthood, by Catholic and Protestant governments. When I come to relate in my narrative the facts of this oppression, many will believe they are taken from the middle ages. But, happily, since the dismissal of the Minister Mantefel, our communities have been greatly relieved in Prussia, and they now advance with new energy.

JOHANNES RONGE.

COQUEREL'S CHRISTOLOGY.*

It may be necessary to inform some of our more old-fashioned readers that *Christology* is the new German term for what they have long expressed in English by the "person and work of Christ." It looks more scientific, but it means just the same,—as is expressed, indeed, in the alternative title of the able and interesting book before us: *Essaie sur la personne et l'œuvre de Jesus Christ*. This, then, is the chief substance of the book; and we propose to give an analytical abstract of its investigations into the scripture doctrine respecting the person and work of Christ. That the book is written "with a view to promote union among Christian churches," conciliates an interest which is amply warranted by the spirit of the whole inquiry. And it has a still further interest to us, as shewing, more clearly perhaps than has previously been shewn to English readers, the theological position of the most liberal minds in the French Reformed Church.

Without further preface we proceed to give an account of the work before us.

A Christology (says M. Coquerel) is matter of scriptural interpretation, of metaphysical philosophy and of moral philosophy. To the first of these his first volume is devoted, the second volume to the other two. After an excellent chapter on the claims of

* Christologie, ou Essaie sur la personne et l'œuvre de Jésus Christ, en vue de la conciliation des Eglises Chrétiennes, par Athanase Coquerel, un des pasteurs de l'Eglise Réformée de Paris. 2 vols. 1858.

the Bible as a book not infallible nor verbally inspired, but teaching the true lessons of divine revelation, and another on the Christology of the Old Testament (which he presents in its proper historical and Jewish light, and not as Christian fancy has retrospectively forced it to appear), in a third chapter he lays down the order in which he means to investigate the progressive shades (*nuances*) of New-Testament Christology. For he maintains that these are distinct and progressive in its various books, and that the neglect of this progress of opinion or feeling in the New-Testament Scriptures has led to false and inconsistent results. The New Testament is not, he says, to be regarded as a homogeneous whole, composed with one view and written near the same time. It is a collection, "like the Old Testament;" but (it might in fairness have been added) with far less diversity of purpose and comparatively little difference of time. For, according to our author, its composition begins about the year 53 or 54, and reaches far down the first century, though to an uncertain period. But the fact would have been more precisely stated (especially with reference to the *nuances* of Christology) by saying, that the composition of the New Testament extends over about ten years, with the exception of the works of one writer, John, whose principal work, his Gospel, if not the rest, is perhaps included within fourteen years from the first. It is within these very moderate limits of time, therefore, that we are to look for the alleged varieties of doctrine respecting Christ in the New Testament.

In what order, then shall we investigate these scriptural phenomena?

There are two modes practicable. The one is, to take the historical order of events; to study the records of the life of Jesus first, and then the preaching and letters of the apostles. The other, which our author adopts, is the order of the *composition of the books*, "the only one," he says, "which has nothing arbitrary about it." It is as follows: (1) The Epistles of Paul. (2) Epistle to the Hebrews. (3) The first three Gospels (called the synoptics). (4) Epistle of James. (5) The Apocalypse. (6) Epistle of Peter. (7) The Acts of the Apostles. (8) The Gospel and Epistles of John. And the successive *nuances* of Christology (progressive we cannot call them as thus brought out) which our author sees in the successive books, are as follows:

(1) Paul's Epistles contain no methodical theology, being occasional and local in their origin, yet universal in spirit. In them there is always preserved a clear, positive and well-defined distinction between God and Jesus Christ, while the two ideas are as constantly united in the work of redemption; the death and resurrection of Christ are made the two principal facts; the former is but one guarantee of salvation, the latter is another, of equal if not superior importance. Jesus, by virtue of such a

life, death and resurrection, is constituted "the second man, the Lord from heaven" (1 Cor. xv. 47); that is, perfect; therefore he is *the last Adam, the heavenly Adam*, "our true, only, legitimate head, the ideal man, man such as God had created him, the type of human nature." Resemblance to Christ is therefore the pledge and condition of salvation. The apostles believed their Lord's coming would take place in their own time (one of the strongest and simplest disproofs of absolute and literal inspiration). But our author fails not to add, that in St. Paul's later Epistles this idea is much modified. He observes that the ascension is not a prominent topic in St. Paul's writings. The "divine greatness of the Saviour" is attested by what Paul says of "the pre-existence of the Son before his mortal life, the creation by his agency, his universal sovereignty and his subordination to the Father." Such (in brief) he finds to be St. Paul's Christology (p. 76).

(2) The Epistle to the Hebrews (which he seems disposed to ascribe to Apollos) is "the earliest methodical treatise on Christian theology, and is of St. Paul's school, addressed to his opponents the Judaizing Christians." It contains nothing relative to the person and work of Christ that is not found in the Pauline letters. It is admirably said, that the analogies traced in this Epistle between the Old Testament and the New, "were demonstrative proof to the Jews, but are to us poetry; we have better proofs of the divinity of the gospel."

(3) The Christology of the synoptic Gospels is next traced. "It has (says the writer) a very special and very remarkable character, justifying some noteworthy deductions. It is designedly kept under restraint; deriving its source from the recollections and traditions of the crowd, it leaves metaphysical thought apart; it is for the most part purely historical and purely Messianic; that is to say, in these sublime but simple pages, '*He that should come*,' the Messiah properly so called, the promised and expected Messiah, is chiefly seen; the Messiahship of Jesus appears everywhere; his Divinity (especially as taught by St. John after the ruin of Jerusalem) scarcely peeps out in them; and if one could imagine the church to possess only the first three Gospels, this last-mentioned belief would hold a very different place in Christian doctrine from what it does." (Pp. 88, 89.)

We shall endeavour by and by to ascertain the sense in which M. Coquerel speaks of the *divinity* of Christ. At present we only remark upon his doctrine of *nuances*. Whether *divinité* mean deity as with the Trinitarian, or pre-existence and superior nature as with the Arian, or divine commission as with some mystical Humanitarians, it ought, we think, to strike those who hold this progressive developement of doctrine as very strange, that the wonderful personality of Jesus should have been unknown (or, if known, a matter of indifference) to the writers of

the first three Gospels (and to those "many" Gospel-writers who had preceded them), and to all readers of the life of Christ down to the time of John's Gospel. Nay, if Paul had already preached and written the doctrine of Christ's *divinité*, and that doctrine was the admitted faith of Christendom, is it not strange that it should not make its appearance in writings devoted expressly to the life and work of Christ, which were not written till after Paul's Epistles, and one of which is the work of one of his favourite companions, Luke, "the beloved physician"? But, taking our author on his own ground, and granting, for argument's sake, the existence of the alleged *nuances*, we must suggest that he has adopted the wrong order of investigation for bringing it clearly and progressively out. From the time of Paul's letters he now, in reality, goes *back* to the time of our Lord's own ministry, say *twenty-five years*, for no other reason than that the records of our Lord's ministry were not *written* till after Paul's letters. But the order of composition of the writings is not that of the growth of the thoughts contained in them. If Christology was progressive (which, in a very modified sense, we do not wish to deny), its progress surely is to be traced first through the most purely historical records of Christ's own life and actions, then through the history of what his apostles said and wrote respecting him after his death. This historical order of *materials* would lead us through the synoptic Gospels first, then through the Acts and the contemporaneous Epistles of Paul, and then (without our affecting further minuteness of arrangement) through the later miscellaneous Epistles and the meditative and retrospective works of John. But our author, taking the books of the New Testament in their mere order of composition, instead of that of their materials of fact and reflection, now recedes from the high Paulinian idea of what he (but not Paul) calls the "divinity of Jesus," to the simple "messianity" ascribed to him in the first three Gospels. In this chapter, however, he gives an admirable account of the Jewish messianic expectation, explains the customary titles Son of David, Son of Man and Son of God, expressly remarking that this last "implied as yet no more elevated notion" than its evident "synonym or parallel, Christ or Anointed." We are somewhat surprised to find him adding on the same page: "The more dogmatic and far more elevated title, *the Son*, did not receive all its significance nor come into use till later; hence the extreme rarity of this term in the synoptics; an important remark, to which it will be necessary to revert. It is natural that the fulness of divinity (*la plénitude de la divinité*) residing in Christ should not have been known before the completion of his mission, when he had been fully manifested." (P. 94.) He finds the title, *the Son*, occurring indeed several times in the first three Gospels; but he labours to shew that it is in its messianic sense on each

occasion, and not in that dogmatic sense of *divinité* in which John afterwards uses it. Yet one of these texts is that which says, "No one knoweth the Father but the Son;" another, where "the Son knoweth not the day and hour;" and the third is the baptismal commission. We confess we cannot see any such difference in the use of the titles, *the Son* and *Son of God*, in the hands of the synoptical evangelists and in those of other scriptural writers; and we venture to suggest that the same kind of criticism, if applied to the latter writers, would explain their expressions also in the higher or Christian messianic sense, and reduce the supposed gradations of Christological thought, feeling or opinion, within much narrower limits than the asserted difference between *messianité* and *divinité*. But our author shall speak for himself in two extracts. Of the introductory chapters of Matthew and Luke relating to the miraculous birth of Jesus and the absence of all allusions to such a belief elsewhere, he says: "The intention of the two sacred historians in including this fact in their books is plain: they wished to give an additional proof, indirect indeed, but well-fitted to strike the mind, of the messiahship and divinity of Jesus Christ. We can imagine, however, that the other sacred writers, Paul and John particularly, may not have thought it necessary to go back in their doctrinal or narrative writings so far as to the birth of Jesus; his messiahship and divinity presented themselves to their minds as established by such testimonies and proofs as to make them regard as superfluous the proof derivable from his miraculous birth." (P. 103.) He sums up the Christology of the first three Gospels by saying that it "does not contain one word at variance with that of St. Paul or St. John; but presents a truthful echo of the faith of the simplest among the first Christians, and that, even in those texts in which the term *the Son* occurs, it is essentially messianic." (P. 135.)

(4) The Epistle of James "is so exclusively moral" that it adds no new matter in a Christological point of view. Our author, however, we may observe, insists at this and every step, as strongly as the most earnest English Unitarian, upon the manifest scriptural doctrine of the Divine Unity and the subordination of the Son. We cannot agree that James wrote in reference to Paul's doctrine of faith and works, or to any abuse made of that doctrine.

(5) The Christology of the Apocalypse comes next. He refers the composition of this book to the year 68, and not to the apostle John as its author. "Its Christology is in accordance with that of Paul;" but "the mistakes relative to the final scenes of the existing economy, and the Jewish hopes of the near approach of the Lord for the ruin of his enemies and the triumph of the faithful, veil in some degree the religious and divine majesty ascribed in this poem to the Son, and, with few exceptions,

deprive the assertions of John the theologian of the precision required by evangelical Christology."

(6) The Epistle of Peter (the first only being regarded as genuine) comes next. It adds nothing to the Pauline Christology; but in adopting it to the extent of even quoting from Paul's Epistles, the generous adhesion of Peter (whom Paul had once "withstood to the face") is the strongest possible confirmation of Paul.

(7) The Christology of the Acts brings us back again (as the synoptical Gospels did once before) to the "purely Messianic level;" again shewing that the believed order of the composition of the books is not the order of developement for the Christological ideas, and tends to confuse the account of such developement as *did* take place. We quite agree that St. Luke in the Acts represents the apostles (Paul included) as preaching in accordance with what he has written in his Gospel; but we cannot accept as having any real meaning the author's assertion that, in the book of Acts, "the higher title of Christ as *the Son* never occurs," while he is repeatedly designated *the Son of God*. For we cannot admit that the shortening of this full title into *the Son* marked a transition of thought from *messianité* to *divinité*. How should it? The thought is identical in the full phrase and the abbreviated one. We must ask, too, how, on the author's theory of the composition of the Acts *after* the destruction of Jerusalem, the Christology of this book comes to be so low? Nor can we agree in the minute but dogmatic criticism which pronounces "incontestibly" that the chief purpose of the book of Acts was "to reconcile the adherents of the exclusive Judeo-Christianity and those of Gospel catholicity," by drawing a partial and softened parallel between Peter and Paul as the representatives of those opposing tendencies of the early church. We are disposed to ascribe to the writer of the Acts a much simpler purpose, namely, that of continuing the history of Christianity already begun by him, in "perfect understanding of all things from the very first," and with a view that others, as well as Theophilus, "might know the certainty of those things wherein they had been instructed." We have a notion that modern criticism often errs, in secular as well as sacred literature, by knowing more about the author's aim, purpose, motive, &c., than he knew himself; and giving to him a more distinct metaphysical grasp of the IDEA upon which he shall artificially put facts together and interweave opinions with them, than he was at all conscious of possessing when he wrote. Especially do we think such minute metaphysical theories inapplicable to the Gospels (John's not excepted) and to the Acts of the Apostles.

(8) The Christology of John's Gospel and Epistles now follows, again carrying the author back to where he had started with Paul, or a little higher still, after his two descents into pure *messianity*.

All the writings of John are placed without hesitation as subsequent to the destruction of Jerusalem. The palpable marks of distinction between John's Gospel and the others, in his omission of many of the most important passages of Christ's life already described by them, and of all our Lord's parables,—in his almost exclusive notice of Jerusalem as the theatre of our Lord's actions, whereas the others have chiefly described his life in Galilee,—and in his full "literal and personal" report of the discourses of Jesus,—are briefly pointed out by M. Coquerel. But he thinks "that the *divinité* of Jesus Christ is the special subject of St. John's Gospel," while it may also have been intended to repudiate the absurd notions of the Docetæ about a phantom Christ. He finds (as every one else must) the titles of Jesus to be more numerous and more varied in John's Gospel than in the earlier ones; and after investigating these with considerable minuteness, and especially analyzing the Proem of the Gospel and maintaining that *the Word* is a "term adopted by St. John to express the personality and divinity of Christ," he sums up the Christology of John's writings as follows:

"Now if we desire to contemplate the Christology of John as a whole, these are the great features of the picture: God, revealed to the world as a Father (and this is the name for God preferred by the author; he recurs to it incessantly in his Gospel as in his Epistle, and none of the sacred writers has employed it so frequently); the only true God (xvii. 3, Ep. v. 20); a pure *spirit* (iv. 24); always *active* (v. 17); *holy and righteous* (xvii. 11, 25); who is *love and light* (Ep. i. 5, iv. 8); our Father and the Father of Jesus; our God and his (xx. 17); who is *greater than all* (x. 29); *greater than he* (xiv. 28); incomprehensible in his infinitude (i. 18, Ep. iv. 12); and, with God, or in the bosom of God, from the *beginning*, before all things, the only Son, of divine nature, Creator, to whom God hath given to have life in himself, the light of the spiritual world, sent from God into our world, the revealer of the true God to the human mind, Saviour and model, who came *in the flesh* for this purpose, the perfect man, judge of mankind, one with God in the same manner as he desires to be one with us."—P. 239.

This is the proper place for us to endeavour to assign the author's meaning in the term so constantly used by him and so much scrupled by English Unitarians, "*divinity* of Christ." It is quite plain that he holds, as sternly and clearly as any one, the sole Deity of the God and Father of Jesus Christ. In proportion as his use of the term *divinité* might seem liable to be misunderstood, he is assiduous in pointing attention at every step of his Christological inductions, to the absolute Deity of the Father and the subordination of the Son. Yet "the Son" is a term denoting the *divinité*, and "the Word" denotes the personality and *divinité* of Jesus Christ. Can we gain a clear conception of what is really meant by a *divinité* which is subordinate and derived, and is not to be for a moment confounded with Deity in its pure and proper sense? We remember the appearance of a little tract

in England, intitled, "The Divinity of Jesus Christ as distinguished from his Deity," which was not looked upon with favour by the Unitarians in general, as it was thought to recommend ambiguity of theological phrase as a possible (but very doubtful) escape from theological odium; for *divinity* seemed to mean no more than divine mission and qualifications. There is a looseness of expression, it must be confessed, in M. Coquerel's use of the word. He has "*la nativité divine de Jesus*," and "*sa naissance divine*," in speaking of the event, which he also designates simply "*le prodige de sa naissance*." Here *divine* and *divinity* need mean no more than *supernatural*. In the same sense we have "*la divinité du Christianisme*" (p. 83). Speaking of the Transfiguration, he asks (p. 118), "Was it a moment of the divine life of Jesus, intercalated, so to speak, in his mortal life, a momentary communication with the world of spirits?" Here the term plainly points to the belief, plainly avowed elsewhere, of the pre-existence of Jesus in a higher state of being. Elsewhere (p. 192) he expressly says, "The notion of *commission* extends to everything, to Christ's teaching, to his various works, to his work of redemption, and even to the glory and the attributes of his *divinity*." Again: "If his divinity were to be understood in the same manner as that of the Being of beings, now, if ever, was the moment for declaring it" (p. 196). The Roman Catholics, we know very well, speak of the *divinité* of the Virgin Mary, which never carries them higher than to her "immaculate conception." But his doctrine is expressed as clearly perhaps as it can be expected, in the following passage by the present author:

"It is beyond dispute that, according to the New Testament, Jesus Christ, man among men during his passage through our world, possesses, in his character as (*en qualité de*) Son of God, an existence anterior to time, unique, divine, mysterious, which is painted in features necessarily obscure and vague, the action of which (*activité*) is totally different from human action, and in which a terrestrial life is, as it were, intercalated. Every sincere mind will agree that, unless the meaning of terms be violated at pleasure, this is the idea of the Saviour presented to us in the sacred books; it is thus that he is represented."—P. 243.

We rarely find anything in M. Coquerel to except against on the score of candour; but we must profess our own sincerity of mind and our total unconsciousness of violating the meaning of scriptural terms at pleasure, while we are unable to accept the above description of the scriptural doctrine respecting Christ. We quote it as perhaps the clearest avowal we can find of *his* view of the person of Christ. He professes not to make his own views prominent in this book; but to have suppressed them would have been impossible, nor was the attempt requisite to the purpose of the book.* No honest man could pretend to

* In this connection he states (Introd. p. xxv. note) that "the Humanitarians of England, in the translation made by them in 1852 of his '*Cours de religion*'

trace the Christology of the New Testament without shewing his own views. What *he* traces as the New-Testament Christology, of course is *his* Christology. We see his *subjectivity* in dealing with the scriptural *objectivity*. No one need dissemble this simple condition of human opinions.

We have briefly analyzed the contents of the first volume of the book before us, if we add that our author, reviewing his own pages, decides that the reconciliation of Christian churches or believers on the ground of *exegetical Christology* is impossible. That is, Christians cannot be brought to agree in their interpretation of the Scripture doctrine concerning the person and work of Christ.

We postpone to another occasion the contents of the second volume, which takes up this reconciliation on other grounds; only adding that in the abstract which we have given of the Christological contents of the first volume, we have by no means brought into view the manifold and various treasures of scriptural knowledge and criticism with which its pages teem. Perhaps the book is more valuable (certainly it is to us far more interesting) for its immense variety of intelligent, learned and free-hearted criticisms on the books of the New Testament and their contents in general, than for its developement of Christological science, the shades or gradations of which we cannot see to be so strong as they appear to this writer, and the exaggeration of which beyond the simple and evident change of position from seeing Christ's work in progress to viewing it as completed (a change of position certainly presented in the progressive New-Testament Scriptures), we consider to be unnatural, unreal, unwise, and even perilous to the credit of Christianity. We do not ourselves accept the Puseyitic idea of *developement* within the New-Testament Scriptures, nor the Romish offer of ecclesiastical creeds and traditions beyond them; nor affect to apply modern metaphysical forms to the elucidation of the simple records of revealed religion.

THE LAST DAY OF 1858.

(ONE OF MIST AND RAIN.)

Dost thou afflicted weep thro' sadd'ning crime
Of man's career,
So often perpetrated in thy time,
Departing year?

Chrétienne à l'usage des catéchumènes,' suppressed the paragraphs which explain his theological views; a kind of omission that I might well complain of, and which disfigures a work deemed useful enough, notwithstanding, to be reproduced."

For lo! with cheerless dripping pall o'erspread
 Thy last-born day,
 And Nature droops, as from thy dying bed
 Life fades away.
 Yet whilst thy wane a dirge-like requiem brings
 In plaintive strains,
 Time for a moment would suspend his wings
 O'er thy remains.
 Think, ere thou'rt fled to join the vast unknown
 Eternity,
 What fruits of promise left us from thine own
 Maternity.
 In bonds of commerce, China and Japan
 Have met the West,
 And soon the Truth shall exorcise the ban
 Which hath deprest
 Millions in serfdom to despotic sway
 And penal pains,
 Who to the moles and bats shall cast away
 Their mental chains.
 Progressive knowledge thro' th' electric cord
 Must all enzone
 In Christian love to know one common Lord,
 One Father own.
 Mercy rejoices in thy ushering in
 That proclamation,
 Which from the Hindú Koosh to Comorin
 Shall prove salvation.
 Gemm'd Asia wears a grateful, gladsome mien,
 And would no other
 To sway her destiny than Britain's Queen,
 Her nursing mother.
 Still be precursor to a better time
 Than thou couldst boast—
 Stern justice with mild clemency combine,
 And such strive most
 For universal brotherhood to give
 Man's right estate;
 And if the past doth this conviction leave,
 Then Fifty-eight,
 With all thy errors, sacrifice and pains,
 Will yet recal
 God's tender care, who watcheth, whilst He reigns,
 A sparrow's fall.
 May peaceful mission crown the coming year,
 That it might be
 No record of its facts required a tear
 On land or sea!

Chatham.

W. I.

NEWBURY CHAPEL.

SIR,

My name is so introduced in a letter from Mr. F. Talbot in your last number, that, if silent, it will be supposed I assent to its views; and I am therefore most reluctantly compelled to express my personal judgment and opinion on a matter in which I was mixed up only as solicitor to the Unitarian Association, and with reference to which I had trusted I should have had no duties except merely professional ones.

If I am now to speak my private conviction, I cannot say that the recent proceedings were not such as in my judgment might, by any party injured, be naturally characterized as "persecuting" (the term which I understand has given the offence which is filling your columns).

The seceding trustees had been bred from childhood in the body, and were the leading members of the congregation. The floor of the large old chapel may almost be said to be covered with the tombstones of their ancestors. They well knew that when they abdicated, it would, with all the aid of the then undiminished endowments, be hard work for the poorer remnant of the brotherhood to keep up worship, and to preserve those tombs from desecration. The alleged doctrinal difficulty, in my judgment, had no rational existence. No one could know better than the old trustees, that the congregation had always been a non-subscribing one; that at its foundation, about 1700, it was, for that day, very "advanced" in its theological views; and that what its bond of union was at its foundation it must remain; and that nine men only out of a congregation, by subscribing an Arian creed in a book 120 years afterwards, could not change such bond. The rest, I do not doubt, refused to sign on non-subscribing grounds. The creed had four articles only: the 1st condemning the Trinitarian hypothesis; the 2nd asserting the pre-existence of the Saviour; the 3rd denying the doctrine of Election; and the 4th asserting the validity of Infant Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as opposed to Baptists and Quakers. The 2nd article created the sole imaginary difficulty. But bred in the body, the trustees knew that, *if this imaginary Arian trust were valid*, and Arianism afterwards died out, Unitarianism would be the nearest form of faith,—the theological next of kin,—and therefore the lawful successor. I am aware that if they, as trustees, chose to imagine a difficulty and to advise with counsel on such imaginary trouble, they would be told they had better place the matter in the hands of the law. Counsel always so advise trustees. That must have been well known to all of them. Go to an homœopathic doctor, and he prescribes globules; or to an allopathist, and he prescribes doses. You will not find *Quieta non movere* to be a trustee-prescription known in the legal Pharmacopeia. But what was the risk, had they then appointed their deserted brethren as new trustees, and handed over the endowment to their care? The event shews, none whatever. They would only have been doing without order, what they have now been ordered to do by the Court. They had then £1445. 11s. 4d., and accruing dividend, £20. 1s. 6d., endowment in hand; of this, £250 has, for their own and the Attorney-General's costs, since been, solely through their acts, expended; and I must say without, as I see, a shadow of benefit to any human being except lawyers. As seceders, they, of all men, should have spared no effort, to abdicate the government of their

father's house of prayer with all reverence to it, and all kindness and tenderness towards those left behind. Such feelings doubtless must have been there; but all trace has escaped my eye.

Mr. Talbot does not, in my judgment, correctly represent what took place on the memorial to the Attorney-General. Nothing could be more admirable than the conduct of the congregation on that occasion. The majority of them still entertain the Arian, and not the Humanitarian scheme; and Sir R. Bethell suggested that if they would undertake to hold the endowment as an Arian one, there would be no difficulty. That suggestion was met by the following resolution of the congregation:

"Nov. 10th, 1859. This meeting, while deploring the continued withholding of the endowment attached to this chapel (by which the congregation is reduced to much distress), yet begs to declare its undiminished adherence to the principle of non-subscription (upon which the chapel was founded), and can accept no overtures from the late trustees, by which that principle is contravened."

The Attorney-General (Sir R. Bethell) used in my presence no sarcasm, but all along felt, I am confident, a deep commiseration for the little remnant of the body; and except for legal difficulties, which I understood arose from the refusal of the old trustees to assist, would at once have dismissed the information. And so, eating up all the while the fund, to its end went on a suit in which not a single person having a particle of interest in the chapel was joined! The very frame of it shews it to be a mockery of justice, as I venture to think.

If Mr. Talbot's statement of the part taken by the Charity Commissioners, particularly as to the letter of Jan. 1st, 1857, be really accurate, some question should be asked about it in Parliament.

Mr. Talbot's letter to you speaks of "the old trustees having now obtained their object." What that object was; or that they ever "obtained" anything, except their costs, I never have been able to make out. If, indeed, it could possibly have been to them a pleasure to see their old fellow-worshippers crippled in their congregational resources by these costs, I could have understood the phrase. But *that* I know could never have been the case with Mr. Talbot, or with any one whom he would accept as a client.

I need not add that the congregation have my sincerest sympathy in the efforts they are now making to replace their wasted funds. I believe it is almost essential to the maintenance of their venerable place of worship, that they should be enabled to succeed; and nothing would give me greater pleasure than to see the seceding trustees actively and gracefully assisting in those efforts.

EDWIN W. FIELD.

36, *Lincoln's-Inn Fields*, Feb. 12, 1859.

THEOLOGICAL PHRASES.

ALAS! how very common it is in theology to meet with set phrases which at a distance seem to assert something, but when approached say nothing and mean nothing! When the Christian religion shall have got rid of eumbrous words without meaning, only one kind of incredulity will remain,—that which is suggested and cherished by bad passions.—ATH. COQUEREL père.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

English Nonconformity: its Principle and Justification. A Sermon preached at Upper Brook-Street Chapel, Manchester, on Sunday, December 12, 1858, in support of Manchester New College. By John James Tayler, B.A., Principal of the Institution. Pp. 20. London—Whitfield.

HEARTILY do we welcome and commend to our readers this enlightened and earnest justification of Nonconformity in connection with the important theological Institution in support of which it was recently delivered. Never has there been a time when it could have been more seasonable than at present; inasmuch as there has never been a time when the rigid and unalterable dogmas of our Established Church have been professedly held in connection with more unhesitating avowal of individual opinions in palpable opposition to them. We never hear of the *Broad Church*, as it is the fashion to call this section of the narrow and creed-bound Church of England, without thinking of the *broad way* which our divine Teacher has stamped with his just and awful reprobation. Without venturing, therefore, to pronounce or to insinuate any judgment on the two distinguished leaders of that Church whom Mr. Tayler mentions (p. 18) in their individual capacity,—considering that, like ourselves, they are answerable as individuals to none but their own conscience and their God,—we cannot refrain (as Mr. Tayler does) from expressing our strong and decided reprobation of *the position* which they occupy, however right it may seem in their own eyes, when one of them publishes a pamphlet to prove that “Subscription [is] no Bondage,” and the other, in the spirit of that pamphlet, renews, on demand, his subscription to formularies which his published writings have just palpably contradicted. We know how such proceedings as these are regarded and treated when they affect any *secular* interests; but in the interests of religion, men either judge not at all or judge by an entirely different rule; as though the latter were either not worthy of regard, or belonged to an entirely different system. Our sympathies, therefore, were warm and grateful with the just and powerful and indignant denunciations of this position and its noxious influences which, on a recent occasion, were uttered by the eloquent colleague of our respected author, and which we quote here in the hope of engaging the serious attention of our readers to their intrinsic moral and spiritual excellence:

“It is sometimes said that our work is superseded, that we have nothing more to do, that others have come up with us, and that they are taking the functions which we were performing out of our hands. We find within the limits of the Established Church itself every one of the favourite truths upon which we dwelt so many years ago, put forth with not less emphasis than they were in our own places of worship. A few years ago, it was deemed something quite horrible to declare that the New Testament was not responsible for everything in the Old, that Christianity was not simply the continuation of the authority of the early dispensation. Now, a learned and scientific professor and clergyman of the Established Church publishes a volume to shew that Christianity is not responsible for Judaism:—that is almost the title of the work by the Rev. Baden Powell. We had been long teaching that it was something monstrous to hold that God could require to be reconciled to man. We find an essay by the Greek Professor of Oxford maintaining

that very position,—an essay which entails, indeed, very serious consequences upon him, and which requires from him the re-signature of the Articles of the Church; a process through which he passes with the greatest nonchalance, and signs the Article which contradicts his essay, and which declares that, by the sacrifice of his death, Christ reconciled God to man. Doctrines are now advanced by examiners of our universities,—nay, by clergymen in this very town,—upon the subject of the inspiration of the Scriptures, which would have driven an Unitarian from the pulpit if he had enunciated them thirty years ago. Well, then, are these persons really doing our work? If I thought they were, and that they did it more powerfully than we could do it, for my own part I would bid them God-speed, and would take up in spirit the words of the apostle Paul and say, ‘Some preach Christ of contention: some, indeed, preach Christ of envy and strife, and some, also, of goodwill: but notwithstanding every way Christ is preached, and I therein do rejoice and will rejoice.’ So far as we are sectarians, I am quite willing to resign the duty into hands able to perform it more powerfully and with more real success. But is this really preaching Christ? For my own part I cannot acknowledge it. Would the apostle Paul have rejoiced and recognized as a preacher of Christ one who was ready, when required, to deny Christ? If it had been, for instance, a priest of Isis or a Roman augur, or the Pythoness of a Grecian oracle, that sacrificed to questionable goddesses to-day, and praised the Christian monotheism to-morrow,—that, among free-thinkers, declared divination to be superstition and an idol nothing in the world, yet, on demand, officially pronounced on the flight of birds and the entrails of beasts, or flung the grains of salt and meal on the altar of any fashionable god,—is *this* a thing in which Paul would have rejoiced as an evangelizing of the world? No. ‘Christ preached,’ in his sense and in ours, is not liberalism in Theology, but simplicity and earnestness in Religion. He is not preached by swearing to one faith and then teaching another. It is not the latitudinarian indifference, but the uncompromising martyrdoms of men, that in the Christian sense are to save the world. To what is this to lead if it is to go on? If men are to be at liberty to bind themselves to one Church while they preach the doctrines of another, to what is it to lead? There is indeed need of preventing Christianity among us from descending gradually into the miserable depths of hypocrisy and pretence into which the Catholicism of France has sunk. What is to stop that progress? It is my firm conviction that with a moral canker at the heart there can be no Christian fruit borne by the stem. It involves an utter decay of devout conviction. And the effect upon shrewd, observing men must be fatal—the effect of this system of paltering in a double sense. It must lead them to distrust the teaching of religion, and to believe that there is nothing but subtlety and special pleading in it. It is impossible that such a degradation of reverence should act otherwise than fatally to the spirit of the gospel. Nor can I at all believe that our proper work can be done by men compromised through their false position, and under the fatal necessity of serving two masters.”*

So much for “the *position* of such men as Maurice and Jowett.” With their private views and personal motives in maintaining it, we do not presume to intermeddle. In contrast with it stands that intelligible and honourable position which our author claims for enlightened English Nonconformity. This is a position of real and unrestricted freedom. No Church based on articles and subscriptions can possibly occupy it, and from every such Church, therefore, the friends of Christian liberty were constrained to separate themselves.

* Speech of the Rev. James Martineau at a soiree given by the congregation of the Hope-Street Unitarian church, Liverpool, December 31, 1858, reported in the *Inquirer* of January 8, 1859; page 27.

"We became Nonconformists (says Mr. Tayler) not from choice, but from necessity; not because we wished to restrict other men's liberty, but because we could not forego our own; not because we desired to impose *our* dogmas on the Church, but because the Church would force *hers* on us; because we saw before us the possibilities of a future when the Spirit of God might demand a freer utterance and a wider agency, and when, if we still maintained communion with a system so tightly fenced in with creeds and articles, we must either remain ignominiously dumb when the Spirit bade us speak, or, if we did speak in accordance with our convictions, must break the vows and belie the professions that we had solemnly taken on ourselves, and blight all our efforts for truth and liberty with the withering taint of flagrant inconsistency."—Pp. 4, 5.

This is truly and nobly said. This clearly defines the *position* on which we have already animadverted, and, in defining it, stigmatizes it as it deserves. Not less just and important is the discriminating exposure of that weakness which we must often have lamented in connection with our maintenance of the true principles of Nonconformity:

"Not that our hereditary principle was wrong, but that the spiritual fervour which should have animated it was wanting; not that our science was too free, but that our piety was too weak; it was not our theology but our religion that was in fault."—P. 6.

Then follows a beautiful exposition of the great end of Christianity and of the true nature of its proselytism,—"*the proselytism of freedom and of love*,"—which we cordially accept, and heartily thank our author for setting so attractively before us (pp. 6—8).

It is with real diffidence that we proceed to express our doubts whether our author is not too ready to assume, as postulates necessary to the very foundation of theology, some things which are rather proper subjects of theological inquiry. Is it the fact that for men who refuse to accept the belief, e. g., of an existence after death, "*the proper science of theology has ceased to exist*"? (p. 10). Is this belief to be assumed prior to investigation, or is not the investigation itself within the proper scope of theological science? In like manner, was there no science of chemistry in the days of Lavoisier and Priestley, because the discoveries of Davy and others have since established fundamental facts of which those illustrious philosophers were altogether ignorant? and may not these facts be still open to farther investigation? Still more perplexed are we by the statement (p. 10) that the "*man who sits down in good earnest to the study of theology*," accepts Christianity as a fact. What? "*Prior to all scientific investigation*?" Do not "*spontaneous sympathies, spiritual experience, irrepressible convictions*," confirm many a Mahometan in his faith in the Koran, quite as much as ever they confirm the Christian in his faith in the gospel? "*An apprehension of the fundamental facts on which the science of theology rests*" (p. 11), is surely not to be gained by the assumption of them as postulates, but by a candid and careful examination of the evidences by which they are shewn to be facts and not mere fancies.

We must be permitted to doubt whether "*we have lingered too long among mere doctrinal rudiments*" (p. 17), seeing how very large a part of the Christian world are still utterly ignorant of these rudiments as characteristic of our faith, and how powerful and incessant are the agencies by which the diffusion of the knowledge of them is hindered. On the other hand, we may well "*throw a deeper religious earnestness,*

more enthusiasm, more spiritual vitality, both into our studies and into our preaching. Our privilege is that we can speak the simple truth without inconsistency" (p. 18). "To the promotion of a catholic Christianity in the consistent application of the principles of true Nonconformity, our Academy is specially consecrated. For a hundred years it has maintained its character, and rendered not unimportant services to Christian learning, liberty and truth" (p. 20). Let us glance, in conclusion, at the encouraging recognition of these great principles of true Nonconformity recently manifested by the highest authority in these realms, in a spirit of intelligence and fervour which is the best evidence of its sincerity. The following is the large and express guarantee for the free exercise of the rights of religion and conscience which the Queen of England, as now Queen of India, has recently given to all her Indian subjects. In the Royal Proclamation issued on the 1st of November, 1858, we read:

"Firmly relying Ourselves on the truth of Christianity, and acknowledging with gratitude the solace of religion, We disclaim alike the right and the desire to impose Our convictions on any of Our subjects. We declare it to be Our royal will and pleasure, that none be in any wise favoured, none molested or disquieted, by reason of their religious faith or observances; but that all shall alike enjoy the equal and impartial protection of the law: and We do strictly charge and enjoin all those who may be in authority under Us, that they abstain from all interference with the religious belief or worship of any of Our subjects on pain of Our highest displeasure."

God save the Queen! The time must come when the Sovereign of England and India will establish the same just and liberal principles in England as in India—though it be a century or so hence; and meanwhile they are safe, we believe, in this marked approval of our Queen, in the increasing equity of our people, and in the special keeping of our College Trustees and Professors, and other members of our church.

NONCON.

Third Report of the Manchester Model Secular School. Jan., 1859.

The "Religious Difficulty" in National Education. By Benjamin Templar, Master of the Model Secular School. Manchester. 1858.

Reading Lessons in Social Economy, for the Use of Schools. By Benjamin Templar. 1858.

A Paper on the Importance of teaching Social Economy in Elementary Schools, read at the Conference for the Promotion of Social Science, held in Liverpool, Oct., 1858. (By the same.)

We have repeatedly expounded the "religious difficulty" as one most needlessly thrust into the day schools of the poor by those who know very well how to keep it out of day schools for their own children, and as tamely and timidly accepted by the Council of Education and stereotyped by them in their Minutes.

The Manchester Model Secular School is a noble reproof to the religionists who make the education of the poor conditional upon their marching in sectarian troops, and to the Council of Education, which has truckled to this meanness instead of surmounting it. This school has now been supported for six years by generous contributions from the rich and comfortable classes in Manchester, being free without any charge to those whose "honest poverty" cannot afford even "school

pence." It is one of the best-conducted and most successful of schools, as attested by visitors well used to inspection. It is a *secular* school, as distinguished from those which are "religious" to the extent of Scripture reading and catechisms; but we venture to believe that its tone is more truly moral and more practically religious than that of most of such schools.

But the Council of Education refuses to grant to this school the aid which is freely offered to sectarian schools of all kinds. By one of their self-imposed Minutes, it is required that the Scriptures be read daily in order to qualify a school for Government aid. It matters not whether they be read by master or by scholars; it is not prescribed whether one verse or twenty shall be considered sufficient. The Scriptures must be read daily. Such is the charm. Jewish schools are aided, in which we suppose the New Testament is not read; so that scriptural reading is not necessarily Christian reading. And even the elementary schools and classes of certain Mechanics' Institutions in Lancashire (which are purely secular schools) are admitted under Minutes of the Council of Education. Yet (shame to say!) the repeated applications of the Manchester Secular School Committee for aid have been refused, and not always very courteously. Let the master read one verse of Scripture daily, and the school will be no longer secular, but religious, in the eyes of the Council of Education! But these Manchester men are not the men to give up their point, or to conform to this suggested piece of easy hypocrisy. In June last, after a public examination of the scholars, thirteen good and true put down their names for £260 as special gifts. The Committee in this Report thank W. Rayner Wood, Esq., for his aid in inducing subscriptions and in conducting the correspondence with the Council of Education; and acknowledge the good service done them by R. N. Philips, Esq., M.P., "on whose motion a copy of their correspondence with the Committee of Council has been printed as a Parliamentary paper." Surely, when next the annual grant is made to the Council, their Minutes and modes of action will be canvassed a little more generously than hitherto.

The school is under an able head-master; and "the master always makes the school." Mr. Templar's little book on Social Economy (very cheaply published for the purpose) ought to find its way into other schools, and would teach the children of working men intelligently to recognize the laws of nature and of society which govern their condition in life, and in reference to which they must wisely and virtuously guide their own actions if they would have success and happiness.

National Review, Jan. 1859.

THERE are many noticeable articles in the *National*. Poets, ancient and modern, are discussed. *Virgil* is defended against his modern critics, Professor Conington and Mr. Gladstone especially; and young scholars are warned "not to be led away by any specious appearance of profundity into rejecting literary canons that have stood the test of long ages of criticism." Truly one often feels the "profundity" of modern criticism to be too profound by far, when it analyzes the genius, the purposes and motives of the poet, ancient or modern, far more minutely than he ever did for himself, till it makes us almost doubt whether

Eclogues or Georgics were ever written, so impossible is every theory of *why* and *how* proved to be! *Crabbe* is recalled (in the 1853 edition of his Works) to the bar of criticism, and is proved to have no love of beauty, and little or no ornament ("when he gives you a simile—as he sometimes thinks it his duty to do—he puts it in perspicuously, adds it ostentatiously, like a Quaker sticking a flower in his button-hole"); he "has no profound ideas and no subtle ones," "and yet is a poet." For "he had imagination;" and "that man is a poet (though there be no limit to his poverty and triteness) who takes up into the receptive imagination any matter whatever, and reproduces it in language under any of those rhythmical conditions which are accepted as forms of verse." *Damning with faint praise*, assuredly. But is that properly *imagination* which is merely "receptive"? Is not imagination essentially "creative"? The reviewer speaks of two orders of imagination, the receptive and the creative, and sets the latter of course far above the former. But is the former properly imagination at all? We doubt it; and do not feel that we have yet gained a definition of poetry. A living poet, *Longfellow*, is also called to judgment for his poems in general, rather than for *Miles Standish* in particular. We confess we are too fond of Longfellow's best poems to assent to the reviewer's general sentence of "commonplaceness of intellectual character;" but we gladly give up his dactyls to classical reprobation, while welcoming the unrhymed trochaics of his *Hiawatha* as, in our opinion, a successful experiment in legendary verse.—An article on the *Results of Short Imprisonments*, well urges the necessity of greatly lengthened imprisonment on each new conviction for those petty offences which are committed by the class of determined vagabonds and pilferers, and which constitute the great bulk of convictions followed by ineffectual sentences of three months' imprisonment. The reviewer stops short of Recorder Hill's suggestion for the police surveillance of those who live in habitual crime; but would let successive convictions soon result in imprisonment for life—terminable, however, as matter of grace, on reliable proof of changed habits.—The *Mémoires du Comte Miot de Melito*, just published in Paris, place the meanness and cruelty, and the conscious selfishness and recklessness, of Napoleon Bonaparte in a stronger light, on the testimony of his intimates and of his own words, even than the estimate of the republican Dr. Channing, who long ago startled the European worshipers of Power by his stern moral estimate of the mere warrior, conqueror and despot.—An article on the *False Morality of Lady Novelists* finds its theme in two directions. In the distorted and morbid approbation of *self-sacrifices* made to worldly and false principles of judgment, the charge is clearly enough established against several popular writers. The charge against Mrs. Gaskell's *Ruth* is not so well made out; nor if it were, is it a clear case of false morality against the authoress. It is a delicate subject, but should be fully met. We need not recal the story. The reviewer thinks Mrs. Gaskell's aim was to "arouse a kinder feeling in the uncharitable and bitter world towards offenders of Ruth's sort" (no doubt it was); "to shew how thoughtless and almost unconscious such offences sometimes are" (thoughtless and passionate, we might prefer saying); "and how slightly, after all, they may affect real purity of nature and piety of spirit" (here we demur); "and how truly they may be redeemed when treated with wisdom and with gentleness" (no doubt here). The

reviewer goes on: "She has first imagined a character as pure, pious, and unselfish as poet ever fancied, and described a lapse from chastity as faultless as such a fault can be; and then with damaging and unfaithful inconsistency, has given in to the world's estimate in such matters by assuming that the sin committed was of so deep a dye that only a life of atoning and enduring penitence could wipe it out." The reviewer hints that the world's estimate of this matter should be braved (almost the only matter of morals in which "the world" is at all rigid). We think, on the contrary, that the authoress of *Ruth* has been untrue to probability in representing *Ruth* as of so high an order of mind and morals, yet as falling almost without temptation and sinning without knowing that she was stained; and that, had she added the reviewer's suggested conclusion, she would have deserved the opprobrium of lax morality which has been thrown upon this article in the *National*.—In the article on *the Religion of the Working Classes* (which goes into Cooper's, Barker's and Holyoake's Secularism, and the orthodoxy of Miss Marsh's *English Hearts and Hands*), the strange avowal is made, in seeming disparagement of "the higher culture," "that the moral and spiritual problems of life will be solved, after the highest culture, on pretty much the same grounds on which they are solved by homely and untutored minds before that culture begins." We notice in this article the strange use of the word *supernatural* in the sense of *spiritual* or *supersensuous*, by which abuse of a term it appears to us that the great question of revelation itself is confused and obscured (whether designedly or unconsciously it is difficult to conjecture) by some of the leading thinkers of the age.—The review of *Mansel's Limits of Religious Thought* does justice not only upon the new Bampton Lecturer, but incidentally upon *Butler's Analogy*, the merits of which we could never ourselves perceive as a book of religious evidence, and "the whole force of which is expended in baffling Theism" and compelling you either "to go on to Orthodoxy or fall back on Atheism." How this book should have kept its prestige so long, we have often wondered, and only found the answer in the parallel instances of the Athanasian Creed and British Toryism—professed but not believed in.—An article on *Parliamentary Reform* concludes the number; in which all proposed plans seem to be knocked to pieces and no very satisfactory one proposed. The reviewer states the problem as being, to give the working classes a distinct, clear voice in the Legislature; and the difficulty as being, to avoid giving them the sole voice, if Mr. Bright's or any similar plan be adopted. He proposes to give up into their hands, by a rating suffrage, London with all its boroughs, Liverpool, Manchester, Bristol, Birmingham, and nine other large towns, all in short that have 75,000 inhabitants. It seems to us a strange compromise to propose with democracy. Nor can we assent to the leading thought of the article, which makes the interests and purposes of the working classes altogether distinct and different from those of all others; which represents them as needing spokesmen of *their own order* in Parliament (which can scarcely come to pass), and forgets that they have infinitely better spokesmen now in such men as John Bright, Thomas Duncombe, John Biggs, James Clay, William Hutt and many others. We hope the wisdom of Parliament will devise a better Reform than this, or let it alone for the present.

INTELLIGENCE.

LITTLE PORTLAND-STREET CHAPEL, LONDON.

It is with entire satisfaction that we record that the Rev. J. J. Tayler and Rev. James Martineau have accepted the invitation of the Portland-Street congregation to undertake the duties of the pulpit so long and ably filled by their late friend, the Rev. Edward Tagart. Differing as we do from these eminent men on some theological and philosophical matters, we appreciate their transcendent abilities, learning and zeal, and are glad that they are both able and willing to return to those duties, the performance of which in Manchester and Liverpool won for both of them a wide renown. They will by their philosophical reputation attract to Christian worship some who would be unmoved by attractions of another kind, and both of them will, we doubt not, faithfully and ably expound the ethics of Christianity, a field of disquisition both fertile and interesting, which Unitarians may traverse with peculiar advantage. Members of other churches will be led through the renown of the two Professors to attend, occasionally at least, on Unitarian worship. Let us indulge the hope that cultivated and thoughtful men who have taken pleasure in the theological disquisitions of Jowett and Macnaught, and in the pulpit services of Kingsley and Maurice, will appreciate in Mr. Tayler and Mr. Martineau the combination of their several intellectual excellences, and will realize the important distinction that separates Unitarians from latitudinarian Churchmen, that the former are consistent as well as free, and pay equal homage to conscience and theological truth.—The two Professors entered on their new duties, in the presence of a highly respectable congregation, on Sunday, Feb. 20. On the previous Sunday, they attended and took part in a meeting of the congregation. The chair was taken by Thomas Muir, Esq. The proceedings began with a resolution to the following effect: "That the best thanks of the congregation be given to the Rev. Hugh Hutton for his great kindness in undertaking the ministerial duties in a case of emergency, occasioned by the sudden and unexpected death of their respected late Pastor, the Rev. Edward Tagart; for the regular and appropriate manner in which he has conducted the various services; for his excellent and impressive discourses of the morning; and likewise for his interesting and instructive course of doctrinal lectures delivered in the chapel

in the evening."—Mr. Hutton acknowledged the vote in a few simple and modest words.

Mr. Stodart (Treasurer of the congregation) then read Mr. Tayler's and Mr. Martineau's joint acceptance of the ministerial office at Portland Street. The two ministers each spoke to the congregation.

Mr. Tayler began by remarking, that he was taken quite by surprise when the proposal was first made to him, as he supposed his work as a stated minister was closed for life. He and his colleague took some time to consider before sending a reply, as they both felt that it was only under certain conditions that they could undertake the work; but finding that those conditions, which were fully stated in a letter circulated in the congregation under their joint names, were not considered as a bar to the renewal of the offer, he came to the resolution to accept it, partly because he felt it a privilege to have the opportunity of steadily speaking to his fellow-men from the fulness of his own convictions and his own feelings on themes which are so interesting to them all, and partly because he felt that the resumption of the ministry might be of service to the College to which his duties were primarily pledged, by bringing it into closer and more vital connection with the church. He said he did not wish to shrink from fair and legitimate work, but only desired by a concentration of energy and attention to do what he did undertake as efficiently as his powers would allow; that a church could not flourish in which all the work fell on the minister; and that, regarding the church not as a mere provision for individual instruction and gratification, but as a spiritual association for joint action on the moral condition of the world, he relied with confidence on the promised aid and co-operation, especially of the younger and more active members, in carrying out the great work of the Christian life, especially in relation to the young, the poor, the ignorant and the wicked. He expressed his satisfaction in being united with a colleague—his associate in another important work, and his kind friend of many years—whose agreement with himself in their leading views of Christian truth and the proper work of the church, gave cheering promise of that ministerial harmony out of which ministerial usefulness was most likely to arise. He concluded with expressing the hope that the union with the congregation that

ESSEX-STREET CHAPEL.

day commenced would prove a source of comfort and blessing to both sides of the relation.

Mr. Martineau said he, too, was taken by surprise at the offer made him to become minister of Little Portland Street. His feelings in accepting it were of a mingled nature, partly sad and partly hopeful,—sad because he felt himself standing in the place of an old friend and College companion—and here he paid a feeling and beautiful tribute to the memory of Mr. Tagart—hopeful because he regarded the ministry as the highest work in which a man could engage; and the feelings of ardour and enthusiasm with which he entered on it in youth had been in no degree chilled or diminished by the experience of many years. He felt that the duties of the ministry, instead of impairing his academic usefulness, would only infuse new vigour and freshness into College work, which, being mainly scientific and intellectual, required even for its own completeness the counterbalance of influences that come from the conscience and the heart. Having spent, like his friend and colleague, a not very short ministerial life in the active and stirring districts of the north of England, he naturally brought the habits of mind and the views of life there acquired with him to the metropolis, and this was one reason why he attached such importance to the associated agencies of the church, and thought its function consisted in something more than delivering and hearing a weekly discourse. If we wished to keep our young people among us and imbue them with a value for our principles, we must systematically instruct them, and give them Christian work to do when they have been instructed. For his part, he was for keeping the public service and the pulpit mainly for worship and religion, and for relegating instruction, especially doctrinal instruction, to the catechetical class and the lecture-room. He and his colleague had stated in their joint letter how prepared they were to enter at once on this work of catechetical instruction. They only waited for the suitable means of commencing it. He was aware everything could not be done at once; but he joined in his colleague's confidence that the congregation which they hoped to gather round them would enable them to carry out the plans which they had suggested for forming catechetical classes for the young, and the more effectual support of schools already commenced for the poor. He concluded with expressing his fervent hope that the union that day formed would be a blessing to all parties.

We have refrained, until the settlement of affairs at this important station of Unitarian Christianity, from noticing the change about to be made in the ministrations in this place. After half a century of public usefulness, the Rev. Thomas Madge feels that the time has come for diminishing and presently withdrawing from public ministerial labours. No minister in our body has for a similar period sustained such an uninterrupted career of usefulness and high popularity. Gifted with remarkable powers of pulpit usefulness, his career at Bury, Norwich and Essex Street, has been most honourable to himself and serviceable to our church. He will carry with him into his retirement the affectionate respect of a wide circle of friends, who, while they regret that they lose the benefit of his instructions, are pleased to think that he carries with him into his intended retirement faculties still clear and bright, and trust that years of comfort and domestic and social happiness are yet in store for him. His elected successor is Rev. J. Panton Ham, of Manchester, who will, we doubt not, prove a very valuable and popular minister, and whose energies will enable him to take his part in all the means of usefulness and influence which are now opening themselves to Unitarian ministers in the metropolis. According to an announcement already made, Mr. Madge will for the present officiate every alternate Sunday morning. Mr. Ham will, however, preach on Sunday mornings, March 13 and 20.

DORCHESTER.

The good town of Dorchester, a place of no mean pretensions to antiquity and historic interest, is one of the neatest and cleanest of English boroughs. Its pure air, the fertile meadows and pastures which surround it, the noble walks by which the town is belted between double rows of elm and chestnut trees, the remarkable Roman amphitheatre close to the town, and the supposed early British encampment at a little distance, combine to make Dorchester a place of more than ordinary interest to the intelligent traveller. It is not, like some of our agricultural towns, given up to the spirit of aristocratic serfdom, nor, like some of our cathedral cities, under an iron ecclesiastical rule. In the neighbourhood of five stately churches, various Dissenting places of worship lift their comely or modest roofs. The representation of the borough is divided between the two great parties in the State. The friends of free and representative principles are

in the ascendant in the Town Council. Among the antiquities of the town, the townspeople shew the house where Cromwell had his quarters; the chair in the Town Hall where the blood-stained Jeffreys sat when sentencing to the gibbet by scores the luckless followers of Monmouth; and they do not forget a dark incident in modern history connected with their town, the imprisonment for two years in their dungeon of the honest and noble-souled Gilbert Wakefield. They point to the window whence the prisoner looked out on the fertile and pleasant plains and hills of Dorset, and they love to tell how the tedium of his imprisonment was diminished by the daily visit of respectful sympathy of their upright townsman, Thos. Fisher, one of the leading merchants of his day, a man who adorned his Nonconformity by the principles of a patriot, the manners of a gentleman and the virtues of a Christian. They also tell how the virtues and patience of the prisoner won for him the respect and pity of the officials of the prison, and softened even the Governor, a hard man of the old Tory school, subservient to the great and insolent to the unhappy ones under his charge. Close to the scene of Gilbert Wakefield's long confinement is the modest Presbyterian meeting-house, which has stood on its present site about a century and a half. The place has some interesting associations. The people familiar with its early history are pleased to tell that here several generations of Channings were wont to worship, and they indulge the thought that the ancestors of Dr. Channing belonged of old to the town, and might be members of that early Puritan church over which the patriarch John White long presided. Latterly there has been no resident minister to the little Unitarian church of Dorchester; or rather we should say, it has had only the services of an intelligent and zealous layman, Mr. John Bishop, to whom be all honour for his watchful zeal in keeping alive the lamp of liberal Nonconformity. Our pages have recently recorded a strange ebullition of bigotry on the part of Rev. F. Perkins, a Baptist minister of Dorchester. Breathing the spirit of Scottish Calvinism rather than of English Nonconformity, his attack on his Unitarian neighbours has injured, not them, but himself. The Western Union, so zealously administered by the Rev. Wm. James and other Bristol friends, has arranged a series of lectures in the town, designed to instruct such of the inhabitants as will attend them in the doctrines and spirit of Unitarian Christianity. This missionary effort is now in progress, and we are happy in being able to report that

it has been hitherto attended with a large degree of success. We need not repeat the names of the lecturers or the titles of their lectures which we gave in our last No. The audiences have increased from the beginning of the course to the present time, and now the chapel is filled in the evening by a congregation of deeply attentive hearers. Nor is the audience confined to Dorchester people. There have been visitors from Wareham and Weymouth, who have come over expressly to hear the lectures. Mr. Perkins has endeavoured, but we believe with no great success, to attract the public to a series of lectures in defence of orthodoxy. The subjects of eleven lectures which he has advertised are before us. They are—1. The Personality and Deity of the Holy Ghost. 2. The Sin against the Holy Ghost. 3. The Works of the Holy Spirit, a Proof of His Deity. 4. The Claims of our Lord to Divine Honour. 5. The Titular Glory of Christ, a Proof of His Deity. 6. The Attributes of Christ, a Proof of His Deity. 7. The Works of Christ, a Proof of His Deity. 8. The Gifts bestowed by Christ upon his Church, a Proof of His Deity. 9. The Worship of Christ, a Proof of His Deity. 10. The Doctrine of the Trinity, the Doctrine of the Holy Scriptures. 11. The Doctrine of the Trinity, the Consolation of the Believer.

Before we quit the subject of Dorchester Unitarianism, we will take the opportunity of reminding summer visitors to the beautiful town of Weymouth, that they may easily join the little church at Dorchester, and, while they share the rational instructions of the accustomed preacher, may cheer by their presence and sympathy a little band of men, faithful under circumstances of difficulty to their religious principles. Our ministers, resorting for health and recreation to the beautiful coast of Dorset, will confer a benefit on friends well deserving help by occasionally conducting the services at Dorchester. When we consider how many Unitarians now resort to Weymouth, by railway only ten minutes' distance from Dorchester, it may properly engage the attention of Unitarian Societies whether a summer mission, of which Dorchester might be the head quarters, could not be advantageously established. For the mission now being so successfully carried out (we repeat), the gratitude of the Unitarian body is due to the Committee of the Western Union. We may add, in conclusion, that the lectures have been followed by the free distribution of Unitarian tracts by English and American authors, and these silent Unitarian missionaries have thus found an entrance into the houses

of Churchmen, Baptists, Independents and Methodists of the county town of Dorset. The British and Foreign Unitarian Association has in part supplied the tracts thus circulated.

UNITARIAN HOME MISSIONARY BOARD.

In consequence of having to go to press with our last number before the examination of the students of the Home Missionary Board was concluded, we were unable to give a completed account of the interesting proceedings.

On Friday, Jan. 28th, the examinations were resumed at 9 a.m. The day's proceedings were commenced by an examination of the senior students in the Epistle to the Galatians. Mr. Gaskell's questions were very searching, and upon the whole the students answered satisfactorily. Dr. Beard then proceeded to examine the senior and middle students in the Epistle to the Romans—its Origin, Translation and Exposition. The examination covered a very wide ground. Good and comprehensive answers were given to most of the questions. Rev. J. H. Hutton, B.A., then examined the whole of the students in Political Economy. The text-book used was Mr. Senior's, and the students manifested an intimate knowledge of the various subjects covered by the very comprehensive list of questions. Rev. Wm. Gaskell, M.A., then examined the senior and middle students in English Literature. The ground covered was from the rise of the English Drama to the time of Milton. Some of the answers given were exceedingly full and clever, and the entire examination was both interesting and satisfactory.

After a short interval for refreshment, the proceedings were concluded by an examination of the whole of the students in "The Art of Preaching," by Dr. Beard. By this time the room was crowded by ministers and laymen. Dr. Beard then said he had a very pleasant duty to perform,—that of awarding two prizes offered by Samuel Sharpe, Esq., for proficiency in Biblical Geography and Antiquities, and for general success in the studies of the Board. The first prize of £3 he then awarded to Mr. James C. Street, and the second of £2 to Mr. A. H. McMaster.

Mr. Bright then expressed the pleasure he had experienced in reading the answers of the students who had taken part in the examination in the Ecclesiastical History of Unitarianism. He then awarded the prize, which was a handsomely-bound copy of "Milman's History of Christianity," to Mr. George Fox, and made honourable mention of Mr. G. Beaumont and Mr. A.

Rushton. He concluded some most excellent remarks by requesting permission to offer a similar prize for an examination next year in the Theology of the Unitarian Church. Mr. Bright's prizes are offered to the students who have concluded their course of studies at the Board.

Mr. Potter then delivered an address to the students, which we give in full in another part of this number.

After the examinations were concluded, a soirée was held in the Town Hall. The attendance was very large, and the proceedings highly interesting, but we have not space to give any detailed account.

OFFERINGS OF KINDNESS AND RESPECT
TO MINISTERS.

Several tokens of this kind have recently passed from congregations or portions of them to some of our ministers. At Bridport, on the 17th of January, at a crowded congregational meeting held at the Assembly-rooms, a valuable and massive Tea and Coffee Service and a purse of Gold were presented by the flock to their beloved minister, Rev. J. L. Short. The inscription notified that the gift was offered after twelve years' service on his part, to testify the respect the members of his congregation feel for his character, the pride they take in him as their representative, and the sympathy they feel with him in his efforts to benefit their town, and especially their appreciation of the honesty, earnestness, diligence and constancy with which he has laboured in the ministry, and their gratitude for light and life by his means communicated to them as a congregation and as individuals.—At Bury, on Jan. 19, a beautiful Tea Service was presented by the teachers and scholars of the Bury Unitarian Sunday-school to Rev. John Wright and his lady, as an expression of gratitude for their energetic labours and valuable instructions.—On Feb. 15, the members of the Dorcas Society connected with the Adrian-Street chapel, presented to Rev. T. B. W. Briggs a handsome Silver Basket, as a token of esteem to their friend and pastor. These several presentations were accompanied by addresses of great local and personal interest, proving the hold the ministers mentioned have on the respect and love of their flocks. We regret that the crowded state of our columns prevents our reporting the meetings in detail. Our American friends frequently get up *surprise* meetings and gifts in honour of their pastors. One at least of the gifts now recorded, that at Bridport, partook of this character, Mr. Short having no knowledge of the valuable gifts in store

for him till they were presented to him in the name of his flock by Mr. T. C. Hounsell, of Wyke's Court.

PROJECTED UNITARIAN MISSIONS IN LANCASHIRE AND CHESHIRE.

We take from a little monthly sheet, published at Bury, Lancashire, by the Tract Committee of the Unitarian congregation of that town, the following particulars respecting a missionary plan now about to be put in operation :

At the meeting of the Provincial Assembly held in June, 1858, a special Committee was appointed to consider the subject of organized missionary effort. This Committee has decided on a plan to be recommended to the congregations of the province, and has requested that collections may be made in support of it in each chapel on January 23rd. The following is the scheme of action.

1st. That this branch of the Provincial Assembly be called the "Missionary Branch."

2nd. That its objects shall be to aid in supporting and strengthening, when needful, such churches as may be in connection with our Association, and in endeavouring to establish new ones.

3rd. That for carrying out these objects, funds shall be raised by subscriptions and donations, and primarily by an annual collection in every consenting church throughout the province.

4th. That its operations be entrusted to a Committee of fifteen, six of whom shall be ministers, to be annually appointed by the Assembly, to which a report shall be made of the proceedings of the past year.

5th. That the Committee shall work by means of one or more paid officers, who shall be ministers, and whose duty it shall be to preach, as occasion offers, in districts where there are no settled congregations, to distribute books and tracts, and generally to promote the objects laid down in Rule 2.

6th. That an Honorary Secretary and a Treasurer be also appointed, and that all communications to the Committee be addressed to the Honorary Secretary.

7th. That a meeting of the Committee be held at least every two months.

UNITARIANISM IN AUSTRALIA.

Letters recently received from Adelaide, bearing date Dec. 11, 1858, report that the Unitarian congregation there, under the able ministry of Rev. J. C. Woods, is in a very harmonious and prosperous con-

dition. Mr. Woods has been compelled in self-defence to take up the weapons of controversy. A clergyman of the Episcopalian Church first broke the peace ecclesiastical by a somewhat intemperate attack on Unitarianism in general and on Mr. Woods' administration of it in particular. He commits himself unreservedly to the Athanasian Creed, both in its temper and its metaphysics. Mr. Woods will find it not difficult to gain a victory over such an opponent. But polemics are no easy task to any one in the latitude of South Australia, where the temperature rises in a man's study up to 110 deg. A great sensation has been created in the colony by the visit of the liberal and very able Independent minister of London, Rev. Thos. Binney. His mental power and oratorical ability have, in combination with his catholic spirit, won for him golden opinions from all sorts of men. A memorial, signed by Sir R. G. Macdonnell, the Governor-in-Chief, and many of the most influential Episcopalian of South Australia, was presented to the Bishop of Adelaide, requesting him to invite Mr. Binney to occupy one of the pulpits in their churches. The Bishop wavered, and was finally frightened into a refusal by the more bigoted of his own party. Much excitement has been caused by the circumstance. One writer of the exclusive party, after making some complimentary allusions to Mr. Woods' power as a preacher, said the Bishop might as consistently ask him as Mr. Binney to preach in one of his churches. An Unitarian availed himself of the excitement to publish an account of Sydney Smith's reading Channing's Sermon on War in St. Paul's, and reminded the Episcopalian ministers as Butcher, Fawcett and others, had been delivered from the pulpits of the Established Church in England; and finally gave a lecture on the only practical basis of Christian union, pointing out, in the *frightful example* of the Evangelical Alliance, that doctrinal uniformity was impossible, and directing attention to a unity of spirit in the bonds of peace and love. The commercial affairs of South Australia are in a very depressed state, owing to the failure of the harvest.

UNITARIANISM AT SYDNEY.

On Wednesday evening, 17th November, the members of the Unitarian congregational church, Macquarie Street, celebrated the fifth anniversary of the religious society by a social tea-meeting of the congregation and their friends. After tea, the chair was taken by the minister, Rev. G. H. Stanley, and a very interesting report was read by

the secretary, Mr. Walter Friend. The report referred in very encouraging terms to the marked progress made since the former anniversary, both as regards the numbers and efficiency of the society and its various institutions. The chapel library had received some valuable additions, and had been more generally used than before. A Sunday-school had been established, under very favourable auspices; and a Religious Improvement Society organized, meeting on Monday evenings, which had been useful in bringing the members together, and called forth some interesting and valuable papers on various important subjects. The services of the choir committee and the organist were favourably noticed, and also the great progress made generally in the department of sacred music. The congregation was congratulated on the possession of the organ recently erected, nearly the whole of the expense involved in its purchase and the requisite alterations having been met. The lectures delivered by the minister during the last few months were spoken of in high terms, their value and efficiency being proved by the fact of many accessions having in consequence been made to the congregation. The report also spoke of the great number of Unitarian Christian books and tracts which had, during the year, been sold or distributed, not only in Sydney, but in the country districts, and said that other and larger orders for books had been sent both to England and America, with the view of forming a permanent depot. After noticing the sister congregations in Melbourne, Adelaide, Ballarat, &c., and also the American Unitarian Christian Mission in Calcutta, under the able and zealous ministry of the Rev. Mr. Dall, the report concluded by an expression of thankfulness to God for the measure of prosperity already granted, and of earnest hope that, with Divine blessing, still greater success would attend its exertions in the future. Various addresses were, after the reading and adoption of the report, delivered by Messrs. McDonnell, Hanson, Langridge, Turner, Holmes, Aaron, A'Beckett, M.L.C., and Williamson, M.L.A.

MR. JOSEPH BARKER ON THE UNITARIAN CHARACTER.

We find in a recent No. of "The Reasoner," conducted by Mr. G. J. Holyoake, a remarkable letter from Mr. Barker, of whose talents for popular address, as well as of his versatility and rashness of speculation, we have sometimes had occasion to speak. The letter will set the candour and amiability of Mr. Barker towards those from whom he now so widely differs, in

a better light than he has sometimes appeared.

"There are some unfortunate misprints in my last letter. There is one rather annoying, where I speak of the Unitarians. It makes me call their system the most pure and *cunning*, instead of 'the most pure and cheering.' This must be corrected, both for my sake and in justice to the Unitarians.

"I am now widely separated from the Unitarians, and am probably regarded by them as lost. Should I now do them an act of justice, no one would be likely to suspect me, I suppose, of sinister motives; so I will do what for many years I have been wishing to do, make known my impressions with regard to the English Unitarians as a body. I had many opportunities of learning their character, and I must say, that I never had met with any body of people so thoroughly and so uniformly kind, or so noble and generous in their aims. And it would be very difficult for any class to be more agreeable in their intercourse with others. I never passed my time more happily than during the period I was so much in contact and in intercourse with them; and there is, in the past, no spot to which my mind recurs with greater pleasure. And nothing gave me greater pain than the necessity I was under of offending so many of them by my political and infidel tendencies. I never blamed them, I trust, and I certainly do not blame them now, for any expressions of disapproval of my course. Had I known when I became Unitarian in my views, that I should pass through Unitarianism to pure Naturalism, I certainly should never, by co-operating with them, and accepting so many favours at their hands, have subjected them to after disappointment. But I supposed that Unitarianism would be my resting-place, and the exposition and advocacy of Unitarianism the business of my life. I was as far from anticipating my advance beyond Unitarianism, as any of my Unitarian friends could be. And to be compelled thus to advance, was as disagreeable to me as it could possibly be to any of my good Unitarian friends. Mr. Cooke, my old Methodistical colleague, foretold that I should not remain with the Unitarians, that I should disappoint *them*, as I had disappointed the Methodists; but I thought him a slanderer; but it is astonishing how clearly an orthodox minister can see where, to be consistent, a Free-thinker ought to go, and how correctly they can foretell, in consequence, where a determined Freethinker will arrive. Sixteen years ago, gentlemen in Newcastle assured me that my mode of reasoning, my rejec-

tion of all human authority and of all compromise, would lead me to Infidelity and even to Socialism. Such terrible forebodings poured in upon me from all quarters, but I regarded them as the utterances of disappointment and vexation. I was wrong; they were prophetic. The thoughtful orthodox believer is, with regard to the last result of Freethought, like the man's horse in Job, in reference to the battle, 'he smelleth it afar off.' What I once regarded as the worst of those prophecies have been fulfilled. I do not regret it; I rejoice in it; but it pains me to think how many good, kind, noble, generous souls have been grieved, how many pleasing hopes have been disappointed, and how many tender ties of love and friendship have been torn asunder. There are men in Leeds, in Halifax, in Huddersfield, in Sheffield, in Chesterfield, in Nottingham, in Derby, in Mansfield, in Northampton, in Birmingham, in London, in Bristol, in Taunton, in Bridport, in Bridgewater, in Exeter, in Plymouth, in—but when should I have done if I were to name all the places where there are men and women whom I have loved, and admired, and revered, and whom it would have been like the imagined bliss of the Unitarian heaven to have been able to count as my permanent friends and fellow-workers. In Bolton, Bury, Warrington, Manchester, Liverpool, Chester, in almost every considerable place in the country, there are men and women whose forms and manner and virtues are still fresh in my mind, and who will be remembered with esteem and love

and gratitude to my latest hour. All honour to them and all happiness! May their lot in life be as cheering as their hopes of heaven, and their usefulness as much as their philanthropy! All the severe rebukes with which some visited me for what they deemed my heretical excesses, were as nothing, seem now as nothing, compared with the kindness shewn me by many a solitary Unitarian friend.

"At an earlier period I met with many kind and noble friends among the Quakers. I never felt, however, as if they had so much cause to be vexed at my becoming a Unitarian, as the Unitarians had at my becoming a Naturalist; because I considered the Quakers bound, as the followers or admirers of Penn, to be Unitarians themselves. Still, it is no pleasure, it is a pain, to think that one has vexed or disappointed any good man. It is a trial, however, which public characters can bear if obliged to be progressive. 'Offences will come,' and all we can do is to make them as light to each other as we can. I have been disappointed in consequence of so many, who began their career with me or whom I found at various points of the road, lagging behind. But I censure them not. I was troubled at others outrunning me, and reaching the goal before me. These I now congratulate. Happy is he who can satisfy his own sense of duty, and feel unfeigned affection and respect for those whose imagined shortcomings or excesses have at any time distressed or disappointed him."

OBITUARY.

Dec. 3, at the age of 40, Mr. THOMAS LANG, of Ilminster. This town, the place of his birth, and the religious society of which he was a member, have suffered a severe loss by his removal from the world. Mr. Lang was engaged in a large business, chiefly as a corn merchant. Possessed of remarkable talents for business, he had formed and matured for himself an extensive union of trades, he had struggled with difficulties only to surmount them, and his untiring perseverance had placed him in a position whence he saw the approach of great prosperity. At this point of time and in the meridian of his life, he was summoned from the present unstable scene, his removal adding another to the many striking mementos of the mysterious dispensations of Providence upon which we must look with a trusting faith. The poor

have lost in him a friend and benefactor; for he not only employed many in his different departments of business, but he was so kind-hearted that he was always ready to assist them in difficulty and relieve them in distress. Their attachment to him was strong and universal. He had won indeed the good opinion and respect of all classes, of which unusual evidence was given on the day of the funeral. The business of the town was entirely suspended, and a numerous train of the inhabitants, sincere mourners, followed the body to its last resting-place. On the following Sunday, the crowded attendance at the Old meeting gave the same expressive testimony of respect and sorrow. Each one present appeared to feel that he had lost a personal friend.

Notwithstanding Mr. Lang's arduous

labours during the week, he was prompt to give his aid to the Sunday-schools on the Lord's-day, denying himself for their sakes a portion of the rest which he might justly have used. In this and in other ways he was a most efficient member of the congregation, and his loss will not be easily supplied. But the great loss falls upon his mourning wife and children. God alone can make up this to them. May they find consolation and strength with Him!

Dec. 12, aged 80, WILLIAM OKE MAN-
NING, Esq., of Reigate Hill, Surrey.

Dec. 28, aged 41, Mr. DENNIS RANDELL,
eldest son of Mr. William Randell, of
Guernsey.

Dec. 29, at Warminster, in the 74th
year of his age, GEORGE WANSEY, Esq., of
Warminster, a consistent friend of civil
and religious liberty, and one who through
a long life adorned his religious profession.

Jan. 1, suddenly, at the Dispensary,
Norwich, ALFRED PENDLEBURY DOWSON,
aged 22, fourth son of Henry G. Dowson,
late of Geldeston, and grandson of Rev.
Pendlebury Houghton, formerly of Norwich.

Jan. 8, at Chowbent, near Manchester,
aged 83 years, MARY, widow of the late
Mr. Samuel HALL.

Jan. 9, at Thorne, Yorkshire, aged 74,
Mr. JEREMIAH WRIGLEY. He was the
survivor of the little band of faithful men
who early in the present century laid the
first foundations of the Unitarian cause in
the town of Thorne, by introducing the
indefatigable missionary, Richard Wright.
Mr. Wrigley won the esteem of good men
of all denominations who knew him.

Jan. 11, at Maidstone, aged 49, Mr.
EDWARD FRENCH, surgeon, a member of
the Unitarian congregation in that town,
much regretted by many individuals and
families among the poor, to whom he was
an attentive and generous friend.

Jan. 12, at Farncombe, near Godalming,
aged 71, Mrs. MARY NASH, late of Little-
ton, near Guildford.

Jan. 19, at Chesterfield, Miss SARAH
CROFT, aged 78. By the decease of this
lady, the town of her birth and long resi-
dence has sustained a great loss. Possessed
of ample means, her generous heart prompt-
ed her to give with liberal hand towards
the support of all institutions which she
believed calculated to lessen human woes

or promote human happiness. With quiet
and unostentatious benevolence she minis-
tered largely to the wants of the poor, and
to the cry of distress was ever disposed to
lend a kind and sympathizing ear. She
was a firm and consistent member of the
Unitarian church in Chesterfield. For
many years she taught in its Sunday-school,
and to the close of her life took a warm
interest in the prosperity of that and all
the other institutions connected with the
congregation. The principles that had
guided her through life, shedding over her
path the brightness of Christian faith and
love, supported her in the prospect of death,
and enabled her in calm and trusting sub-
mission to go onward at her Heavenly
Father's bidding. Her earthly remains
were deposited in the family grave in the
burial-ground attached to the chapel which
she had through life so regularly attended,
and on the following Sunday the minister
endeavoured to improve the event, in the
presence of an unusually large and sympa-
thizing congregation. As a mark of respect
to the deceased, the chapel was hung with
black, and it may be added, as an evidence
of the estimation in which she was held in
the town, that a most respectful obituary
notice of her appeared in the local Conser-
vative paper, together with a long report
of the funeral discourse. May the society
which mourns her departure pay to her
great worth that purest tribute which con-
sists in the fond memory of her benevo-
lence and the imitation of her virtues!

Jan. 21, ELIZABETH, the beloved wife
of Mr. Matthew ATKINSON, druggist and
chemist, Stratford New Road, Manchester.
Her native place was Hindley, near Wigan.
As she grew up, she became a constant
attendant at the Presbyterian chapel there.
She was an attentive hearer, a devout
worshiper of God, and a sincere disciple
of Jesus Christ, of which she gave the best
possible proof "by keeping his command-
ments." For some years she was an active
and efficient teacher in the girl's Sunday-
school at Hindley, and many will have to
bless her memory for her kind instructions.
She became a wife May, 1857, and in less
than two years she died, aged 29 years.
How short the space between! What a
warning voice is here! "Be ye also ready!"
She was ready. And when asked by a
respected minister of the Unitarian deno-
mination, who was requested to visit her
not long before she expired, "Are you
afraid to die?" she replied, with calm,
Christian dignity, "Oh no!" The Chris-
tian "hope was the anchor of her soul." On
Sunday, Jan. 30, a few days after her
burial at Hindley, the minister of the

chapel improved the solemn event to the congregation, survivors and relatives of the departed.
J. S. R.

Feb. 1, at Stockton-on-Tees, ANNA, widow of the late H. R. E. WRIGHT, Esq., solicitor, aged 79.

Feb. 3, at his residence, Grove Street, Hackney, EBENEZER GOSBELL, Esq., aged 56 years, beloved and respected by all who knew him.

Feb. 7, at 3, Laura Place, Clapton, aged 82, ELIZABETH, widow of the late Joseph CURTIS, Esq.

Feb. 7, at Dorchester, aged 25, THOMAS, second son of Mr. John BISHOP, of that town. This amiable and promising young man was cut off after but a short illness, in the midst of sanguine hopes and unfinished schemes. To the last moment the powers of his mind and the affections of his heart were retained in unimpaired vigour, and whilst, as regarded himself, he was perfectly resigned to the will of the Heavenly Father, his dying words breathed a message of love to those of the family circle who are living at a distance from their early home. His mortal remains

were placed in a family grave in the Unitarian chapel, Dorchester, the Rev. J. L. Short, of Bridport, officiating on the occasion; and on the following Sunday the same minister again kindly gave his services, and preached a funeral sermon to the congregation of which the deceased was a member.

Feb. 7, aged 9 years, CAROLINE, daughter of Mr. Anthony MARTIN, of Evesham.

Feb. 10, at Malton, Yorkshire, aged 77 years, Mr. DAVID SMITH.

Feb. 14, at Bridport, Dorset, aged 21, SELINA, eldest daughter of Mr. Thomas RALLS.

Feb. 16, at Broomfield, Ainsworth, Lancashire, aged 70 years, Rev. JAMES WHITEHEAD, minister of the Presbyterian chapel at Ainsworth more than 41 years. Of this estimable man we hope to receive, for an early number of the Christian Reformer, full biographical particulars.

Feb. 20, at the residence of his son-in-law, the Rev. Dr. Beard, Manchester, Mr. CHARLES BARNES, formerly of Portsea, Portsmouth, in his 81st year.

MARRIAGES.

Oct. 15, at the Unitarian church, Adelaide, South Australia, by Rev. J. C. Woods, JOHN HOWARD CLARK, Esq., of Hazlewood, near Adelaide, second surviving son of the late Francis Clark, Esq., to LUCY, eldest daughter of Edward Montgomery MARTIN, of Norwood, near Adelaide, both formerly of Birmingham.

Dec. 25, at Westgate chapel, Wakefield, by Rev. Goodwyn Barmby, THOMAS LOGAN to SARAH PEARSON, both of Wakefield.

Dec. 26, at the Unitarian chapel, Wareham, by Rev. Maxwell Davidson, Mr. HENRY BOYT to Miss ELLEN HIBBS, of Wareham.

Dec. 26, at Lord-Street chapel, Oldham, by Rev. C. W. Robberds, JAMES LEES to MARY EASTWOOD.

Dec. 27, at Hope-Street church, Liverpool, by Rev. James Martineau, GEORGE B. WINDELER, Esq., of London, to MARIANNE, second daughter of Charles T. BOWRING, Esq., of Prince's Park, Liverpool.

Jan. 6, at the Unitarian church, Hackney, by Rev. R. Brook Aspland, M.A., Mr. WILLIAM H. HARROWIN, of High Street,

Kingsland, to Miss CHARLOTTE HARRIS, of the same place.

Jan. 24, at the Unitarian chapel, Doncaster, by Rev. W. Elliott, GEORGE WAINWRIGHT, Esq., of Blaxton Grange, to Miss MOWBRAY, of Bessecar.

Feb. 3, at the Unitarian chapel, Doncaster, by Rev. W. Elliott, Mr. ALFRED COULTHREAD, of Formingley, to Miss LILLEY, of Blaxton Grange.

Feb. 9, at the Unitarian chapel, Brighton, by Rev. J. P. Malleon, Mr. CHARLES PAUL BURGESS, son of James Burgess, of Battle, to FRANCES ELIZABETH HOLMES, of Brighton.

Feb. 17, at Cross-Street chapel, Manchester, by Rev. Francis Bishop, of Chesterfield, Mr. EBENEZER JONES to MARY, eldest daughter of Mr. Thomas Lowe, superintendent of the Domestic Mission Sunday-school, Manchester.

Feb. 19, at the New Meeting-house, Birmingham, by Rev. Samuel Bache, Mr. S. B. WHITFIELD, of Oxford Street, to SELINA MARY HANNAH, youngest daughter of Mr. J. ILSLEY, of Birmingham.